DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 257 696 SO 016 443

AUTHOR	DiMaggio, Paul
TITLE	The Careers and Opinions of Administrators of U.S. Art Museums, Resident Theatres, Orchestras, and Local Arts Agencies.
SPONS AGENCY	National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Apr 85
GRANT	NEA-02-4050-001
NOTE	204p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Characteristics; Administrator Qualifications; *Administrators; *Attitude Measures; *Careers; *Fine Arts; Museums; Orchestras; Public Agencies; Social Science Research; Surveys; Theaters

ABSTRACT

Addressed to practitioners, donors, and policy makers, this document describes and compares responses to survey questions administered to top managers of resident theaters, art museums, symphony orchestras, and local arts agencies. Chapter 1 discusses research methodology and design. Organizations participating in the project included 102 theaters, 113 orchestras, 132 art museums, and 171 community arts agencies. Chapter 2 looks at family backgrounds, educational preparation, and career experiences of arts administrators. Chapter 3 considers career satisfaction and expectations for future employment. Chapter 4 analyzes questions about the preparation arts administrators receive for their positions. Chapter 5 looks at such professional participation outside the administrator's own organizations and examines attitudes about professionalism. Chapter 6 analyzes administrators' attitudes towards the missions of their organizations. Chapter 7 discusses specific themes that emerge from the previous chapters, and considers the implications of these themes for practitioners and policy makers. (IS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED257696

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

THE CAREERS AND OPINIONS OF ADMINISTRATORS OF U.S. ART MUSEUMS, RESIDENT THEATRES, ORCHESTRAS, AND LOCAL ARTS AGENCIES

Paul DiMaggio
Yale University

April, 1985

SO 016 443

Report prepared for the National Endowment for the Arts, Research Division under Grant NEA-02-4050-001.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction (12 pages, no tables)

Chapter 2: The Backgrounds, Recruitment, and Careers of Arts Administrators (24 pages, 9 tables)

Chapter 3: Rewards and Expectations (23 pages, 9 tables)

Chapter 4: The Training of Arts Administrators (23 pages, 3 tables)

Chapter 5: Professional Participation and Attitudes Towards Professionalism (25 pages, 10 tables)

Chapter 6: Administrators' Attitudes Towards the Missions of Their Organizations (20 pages, 8 tables)

Chapter 7: Summary and Conclusions (15 pages, no tables)

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

America's first arts organizations were founded in simpler times. When Henry Lee Higginson established the Boston Symphony Orchestra in 1881, its business affairs could be handled by a single assistant, amply advised (on a volunteer basis) by Higginson himself. Approximately one mile from the orchestra's offices, the new Boston Museum of Fine Arts was also managed by a skeleton crew, with trustees doing most of the work. Even in the 1950s, when the resident-theatre movement began to build force, most theatres were administered by their charismatic founders, often during moments stolen from artistic duties. In all of these settings, the key personnel were specialists in the artistic work at the core of their organizations' missions. For many years, conductors, curators, and artistic directors held undisputed sway as the most visible and most important members of the institutional art world.

During the last two decades, full-time administrative roles have become more common in and more important to America's arts organizations. Two factors have led to greater formalization and salience of the administrative function: The first is growth, the second the increased complexity of the arts organization's external environment.

It is a staple of the management literature that growth leads to differentiation, and differentiation increases the demands on administrators.[1] What this means is that, as organizations grow, they take on more tasks and need more employees to carry out the tasks they have already taken on. As the number of tasks and the number of employees increases, functions that had been carried out by a single person are delegated to additional personnel, who may eventually be designated as a discreet department. (In theatres, for example, artistic directors begat managing directors who begat marketing, development, and public relations staff.) The more employees and departments, the harder it is to coordinate their activities. (The artistic director of the 1950s may have had a difficult time handling her theatre's administrative chores, but at least her right hand knew what her left hand was doing.) Consequently, management becomes more essential.

---

[1] Peter M. Blau and Richard A. Schoenherr. 1971. *The Structure of Organizations*. N.Y.: Basic Books.

In addition to such internal pressures for increased administration, the growing complexity of many arts organizations' external environments has also increased the amount and importance of managerial work. The museum director of the 1930s had only to manage his curators and volunteers, pursue collectors, and, if his museum benefitted from municipal funds, court an occasional politician. The museum director of the 1980s seeks support not just from private patrons, but from corporations, private foundations, and state and federal government as well. To maintain legitimacy in the eyes of these new patrons, he or she must be more concerned than his or her predecessors both with the museum's "public image" and success in attracting visitors, and with the ability of the museum to produce reasonably complete and auditable accounts that meet the requirements that public and private agencies impose. Consequently, museums today are more likely than in the past to have an assistant or associate director for administration, a controller, and departments that, like marketing, public relations, development, and, in some cases, government relations, concern themselves with the museum's relationships with its environment. What is more, the director is likely to devote more time to administration and public relations and less time to scholarship than was true of his predecessors.[2]

These changes have been acknowledged by arts organizations, service organizations, foundations, and public agencies. Interviews with the chief executive and operating officers of arts organizations suggest that most arts organizations' boards have become increasingly concerned with the quality of administration in recent years. Service organizations have established internships, workshops, and other training programs to prepare and assist administrators. The National Endowment for the Arts, through its "Services to the Field" funding categories, has aided many efforts to improve administration, and many state arts agencies sponsor extensive technical assistance programs. Private foundations have supported workshops, conferences, and arts-administration degree programs, as well.

Despite this activity, however, we know little about the individuals who are currently occupying the top administrative posts in our nations' arts organizations, about their backgrounds and training, about the nature of managerial careers, and about their attitudes on management and policy issues. Until now, research on arts administrators has been restricted primarily to salary studies. Such research is valuable, but tells us little about executive labor markets in the arts, nor about the individuals who occupy executive positions.

The Organization of This Report

It was the purpose of the research that is the subject of this report to make available to practitioners, donors, and policy makers information on the administrators of four important kinds of arts organizations: resident theatres, art museums, symphony orchestras, and community arts agencies.[3] Each chapter of this report describes responses to questions from surveys administered to top managers in each of these fields. In each section, we first compare the responses of administrators from each of the four fields; and then look at notable variation in responses within each field associated with such factors as cohort, organization size, and career experience.

---

[2] W. Richard Scott and John Meyer, *Organizational Environments.* 1983. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.

Chapter 2 looks at the family backgrounds, educational preparation, and career experiences of our respondents: how they were recruited into the arts, what experiences led up to their first top administrative position, and job movements occurring after the first top managership.

Chapter 3 examines the rewards that arts administrators receive from their jobs, particularly control over resources (as measured by organization budget), salary, and a range of noneconomic satisfactions. This chapter also looks at respondents' expectations about future employment, in particular at those respondents who do not expect to continue to work in the arts.

Chapter 4 analyzes questions concerned with the preparation that arts administrators receive for their positions: where they get it, its adequacy, and their evaluation of several alternative training formats. Data are analyzed both on global assessments of specific kinds of training and on evaluations by administrators who have experience with each form of training for specific management functions.

---

[3] When this research was undertaken, "community arts agency" was the conventionally employed term for organizations that now refer to themselves as "local arts agencies." The service organization for this field, the National Assembly of Local Arts Agencies (NALAA) was then named the National Assembly of Community Arts Agencies (NACAA). Throughout this report, the term "community arts agency" is used to refer to the agencies at the time of the survey, while "local arts agency" is used as the generic or contemporary reference.

Chapter 5 addresses the issue of "professionalism" in arts management. After developing a definition of professionalism based on studies of professionals in other fields, we look, first, at the extent of arts administrators' participation in professional activities outside of their own organizations; and, second, at responses to questions tapping attitudes that are traditionally associated with professionalism.

Respondents were asked a range of questions about their attitudes towards policy and management issues, many of which are related to their views of the missions of their organizations. Results of analyses of responses to these questions are reported in chapter 6. Factor analyses revealed, in each field, clusters of attitudes that can be characterized as reflecting, respectively, managerial and social orientations. The determinants of these orientations are explored.

The concluding chapter discusses specific themes that emerge from the previous chapters, and considers the implications of these themes for problems facing practitioners and policy makers in the field investigated here.

The material in this report has been selected to represent the major findings of the study. For the sake of brevity, reports of many analyses have been omitted. A much longer, more exhaustive preliminary report of the findings of the study, which includes copies of the survey instruments, is available for study at the offices of the National Endowment for the Arts, Research Division. Where statistics are cited in the text of this report but full tables are not provided, such tables are included in the preliminary report.

Methodology and Design

Survey instruments were mailed to the chief operating officers of four populations of arts organizations, with requests that they be completed and returned. Each survey instrument was reviewed by at least one NEA Program staff member and at least one staff person at the appropriate service organization. (Chief operating officers were identified by initial telephone calls to the organizations whose managers were to be surveyed.) The initial survey was followed by a second mailing, also including a survey form, and, where necessary, by a follow-up postcard and by one or more telephone calls.

An effort was made to survey top managers of the major organizations in each of the four fields studied, but the population definition differs somewhat among the four. Managing directors of the 165 member resident theatres listed in *Theatre Profiles IV* of the Theatre Communications Group constituted the resident-theatre population. In a few cases in which a resident theatre had both an "executive producer" and a "general manager," the former was surveyed.[4] Several artistic directors who also played the role of managing directors for their theatres were included. In one case of collective management by a theatre's artistic personnel, no survey was administered.

The 165 theatres surveyed included all or almost all of the largest resident theatres in the United States, as well as most of the artistically prominent ones. Surveyed theatres included the membership of the League of Resident Theatres, received approximately 80 percent of all National Endowment for the Arts grants to theatres in 1979, and included all 29 of the theatres listed as having staff on the NEA Theatre Policy and Grants Panels in 1977 through 1979. Although one study of the nonprofit theatre universe counted 620 nonprofit theatres in the United States in 1980, only some of these were resident theatres.[5] Of the resident-theatre universe, the group surveyed is less likely to include very new, very small, or very poor theatres, or theatres that are devoted in large part to social rather than to conventionally defined aesthetic goals.

---

[4] David J. Skal, Ed. *Theatre Profiles 4*. 1979. New York: Theatre Communications Group.

In the case of orchestras, managers of all the U.S. member organizations of the American Symphony Orchestra League major, regional, and metropolitan categories (156 in 1979) were surveyed.[6] In a few cases in which an orchestra had both an executive director and a manager, the former was asked to complete the survey. Interviews indicated that the American Symphony Orchestra League membership included all orchestras in the major and regional categories and 95 of 105 orchestras in the "metropolitan" budget range.

Because the American Association of Museums does not publish lists of art (as distinct from other) museums, identification of the largest art museums was a more complicated matter than the identification of major resident theatres and orchestras. The primary source of names of larger art museums was the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) 1978 Museum Universe Survey.[7] Analysis of that survey yielded a list of 137 art museums with operating budgets of $120,000 or more. Also using the

---

[5] Mathtech, Inc. *Conditions and Needs of the Professional American Theatre*. 1980. Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Arts, Research Division.

[6] *Resource Guide*. 1979. Vienna, Virginia: American Symphony Orchestra League.

[7] See Macro Systems, Inc., *Contractor's Report: Museum Program Survey, 1979*. 1981. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics.

NCES Universe Survey, we added other art museums reporting attendance of 60,000 or more, or a total budget of $220,000 or more, that were not on the original list.[8] This list was checked against the *Museum Directory 1980* to screen out museums incorrectly classified as art museums, yielding a total of 175 institutions.[9] To this total were added thirteen art museums reporting budgets of $500,000 or more in the 1978 *American Art Directory*, but not included in the NCES list; and four museums with directors who were members of the Association of Art Museum Directors (AAMD), but which did not appear on the NCES-generated list.[10] The total population of large art museums derived in this way numbered 192.

In developing a list of community arts agencies, we benefitted from the help and cooperation of the National Assembly of Community Arts Agencies (NACAA) (now the National Assembly of Local Arts Agencies), in particular, its directors, Chick Dombach and Gretchen Weist, who kindly made available to us results of their own survey of NACAA's membership.[11] Directors of all agencies reporting a full-time professional administrator in response to that inquiry were included in the current study's population. NACAA estimated the universe of community arts agencies to number approximately 2000. Although we cannot assess rigorously the extent to which the agencies in our population differ from agencies that were not NACAA members and/or those without full-time paid administrators, it is likely that our agencies are larger or more wealthy than most (because they can afford to employ full-time directors) and are relatively cosmopolitan (because they participated in a national organization). Nonetheless, special caution is required in interpreting findings of the survey of community arts agency directors because we know so little about the universe of agencies.

---

[8] Some responding museums provided only "total budget" figures rather than "operating budget" information. Where attendance reports appeared inflated, i.e. where they were inconsistent with data on budget and hours, museums were dropped.

[9] The American Association of Museums. *The Official Museum Directory 1980*. 1979. Skokie, Illinois: National Register Publishing Co., Inc.

[10] Jacques Cattell Press, *American Art Directory*. 1980. New York: Bowker.

[11] On the use of "community arts agency" and "local arts agency," please see note 2 to this chapter.

After eliminating organizations that were defunct or that did not, at the time of the survey, have full-time executives, response rates were 68.67 percent for the theatre managing directors (N=102); 72.67 percent for the orchestra managers (N=113); 67.20 percent for the art museum directors (N=132); and 86.54 percent for the community-arts agency directors (N=171). (The latter survey was co-sponsored by NACAA.)

Merging our data with information from *Theatre Profiles IV* permitted a variety of response-bias tests to be undertaken for the resident-theatre managing directors. These tests revealed that respondents' and nonrespondents' theatres were similar across a wide range of test variables, including region, house capacity and percentage of seats filled, percentage of income that is earned, and mean income.

Only museum region could be used to test for response bias among the art museum directors. Among this group, response was somewhat higher for directors from the Great Lakes, Mid-South, and Gulf regions (74.19 percent) than among directors from the Pacific, Northwest, Southwest, North Plains and South Plains regions (60.00), with the response rate of directors from New England, the Middle Atlantic States, and New York close to the population mean.

Response rates of orchestra managers did not vary by region, but did by the other test category, ASOL budget classification. Almost all of the regional manager (96.30 percent) responded to the survey, compared to only 63.83 percent of the metropolitan managers. Response from major managers was close to the population mean.

Our survey was merged with data from NACAA's 1980 survey (from which our sample was derived), providing several tests of sample bias. Response rates were very similar by region, degree of urbanization of community served, and budget size. But directors of undesignated private nonprofit agencies were less likely to respond (78.13 percent) than were directors of either publicly designated nonprofit (90.32 percent) or public (92.11 percent) community arts agencies.

None of the surveys, then, appears to be flawed by dramatic response bias. Consequently, with the qualifications cited above and given the relatively high response rates, findings of survey analyses can, for the most part, be generalized to the populations surveyed.

Nonetheless, certain caveats should be observed in interpreting the data presented in the following chapters. First, the findings cannot be generalized beyond the populations surveyed: in the case of the theatres, orchestras and art museums, executives of the 150 to 200 major institutions in each field; and, in the case of the community arts agencies, those NACAA members that indicated that they had a full-time paid director. This is not a major disability, however, since the organizations surveyed account for the great bulk of expenditures in their fields, and many smaller organizations may not have full-time paid managers.

In a few cases, particularly in the survey of theatre managing directors, substantial item nonresponse renders interpretation of specific results difficult. All tables indicate the number of respondents upon which results are based; and the most striking instances of item nonresponse are mentioned in text or notes Other caveats apply only to specific chapters and are described at length in the text of those chapters.

The author is obligated to many people and organizations for help in undertaking and completing this study. In addition to the National Endowment for the Arts, Research Division, the Yale University Program on Non-Profit Organizations provided financial support for this research, and data analyses were supported by Yale University through the Institution for Social and Policy Studies, School of Organization and Management, and Department of Sociology.

The largest debt of appreciation is owed the many administrators who took time from their usually oversaturated schedules, often with extraordinary good humor, to complete the surveys. Many arts administrators, service-organization staff, and staff of public arts agencies, some of whom would prefer to remain unnamed, provided invaluable critical reviews of draft survey instruments. The good counsel and patience of Tom Bradshaw, Harold Horowitz, and John Shafer of the National Endowment for the Arts, Research Division, is much appreciated, as is advice on survey drafting from a number of present and former Yale colleagues, especially John Kimberly, Walter Powell, and Janet Weiss. Ella Sandor of the Yale Program on Non-Profit Organizations facilitated the administration of the study throughout, and Barbara Mulligan and Marilyn Mandell provided superb clerical (and, at times, more than clerical) assistance during the survey phase. Thanks is due Caroline Watts, Elizabeth Huntley, and Naomi Rutenberg for dedicated research assistance in undertaking the survey; Frank P. Romo, for advice on data analysis; and,

especially, Kristen Steinberg, for superb assistance in data analysis and for extraordinary feats of diligence, patience, and creativity in data management.

CHAPTER 2: THE BACKGROUNDS, RECRUITMENT, AND CAREERS OF ARTS ADMINISTRATORS

Many of the most critical managerial problems facing American arts institutions have to do with the careers of the individuals who manage them. An artistic discipline must induce capable managers to enter career paths that lead to executive positions. It must provide these individuals with the experience and knowledge that will enable them to perform effectively as top executives. And it must reward talented executives sufficiently that they will remain in the field throughout their careers.

In short, for a field to attract and retain talented managers, it must provide careers - sequences of jobs that lead to desired end points - to motivate individuals to participate. Orderly careers allow individuals to compare their progress to that of their peers, to seek proximate goals with some certainty that they will lead to valued long-range outcomes, and to work from day to day with some confidence that competent performance will be rewarded. Where careers are chaotic (where the paths to higher positions are irregular and unpredictable) or where opportunities are few, it will be difficult to induce to induce talented managers to enter a field; and, if they do, it may be difficult to persuade them to stay.

Individuals and service organizations in all the artistic disciplines have expressed concern about administrative recruitment.[1] But, as yet, we know little about who art managers are, where they come from, where they are schooled, what they study, and how they make (or fail to make) careers in the fields they enter.[2] Where concern is great and information meager, stereotypes abound. Managerial careers in the arts are said to be characterized by instability and job-hopping. Arts managers are sometimes portrayed as failed artists, frustratedly accepting executive positions for which they are unqualified as substitutes for artistic roles they would rather play. Or, alternatively, it is alleged that arts administrators are "just" managers, knowledgeable about accounting and marketing, but insensitive to the particular needs and demands of their artistic disciplines.

---

[1] See, e.g., Judith Kurz, "Meeting the challenge: Management fellows train for the eighties and beyond," *Symphony* (August/September, 1982): 39-44; Theatre Communications Group, "Institutionalization: Bane or blessing to the art of theatre? Pp. 51-52 in *Report of the 1980 National Conference.* New York: Theatre Communications Group; Alan Shestack, "The Director: Scholar and businessman, educator and lobbyist," *Museum News* 57, 2 (November/December, 1978): 27-31 ff.; and Ralph Burgard, "The elaborate minuet and other hard lessons," *American Arts* (March 1980): 18-19.

In this chapter, we shall examine the realities of management careers in four artistic disciplines and, in so doing, judge the adequacy of some of these stereotypes. What we shall see (among other things) is that:

*Most managers are not failed artists: While some have had brief artistic experience, most go into management at an early stage in their careers.

*Nonetheless, even career managers are not artistically inexperienced: Substantial proportions of managers in each artistic field have undergraduate degrees in the art forms they manage. Those who do not are more likely to have degrees in the humanities than in arts administration or general management.

*Some changes can be seen among cohorts of arts managers in these fields, particularly an increase in the level of formal education and an increase in the number of women in top managerial ranks.

*Nonetheless, in the fields we studied, managerial careers are, for the most part, relatively chaotic. In no field is there one, or even two, major sequences of jobs that are common to most top managers.

In the sections that follow, we shall look, first, at the backgrounds of arts managers in four disciplines; second, at their recruitment; and, third, at their advancement and career experiences. In considering these findings, the reader should keep in mind that the effects of background and recruitment opportunities are conditioned by such broader factors as changes in labor-market conditions in the economy as a whole (e.g., the sellers' market in the 1960s and the buyer's market of the late 1970s and early 1980s) or the massive increase in college attendance in the 1960s.[3]

---

[2] For a notable exception, see Susan Stitt and Linda Stein, *The Museum Labor Market: A Survey of American Historical Agency Placement Opportunities.* 1976. Sturbridge, Massachusetts: Old Sturbridge Village.

Educational and Social Backgrounds

The disciplines varied in the proportion of top managers who were men, from 45 percent in community arts agencies to 85 percent among art museum directors, with about two thirds of all top executives male in theatres and orchestras. One quarter to one half of the managers in each field were born in the northeast. Museum directors, as a group, were the oldest respondents, with a mean age of 48. Theatre managing directors and community arts agency (CAA) directors were the youngest, with a mean age of 40.

Managers in each field were predominantly upper middle class in social background. Museum directors and theatre managing directors were slightly higher on most measures of family status than were orchestra managers who, in turn, came from slightly higher status backgrounds than CAA directors. Museum directors were somewhat more likely (59 percent) and CAA directors somewhat less likely (39 percent) to have college-educated fathers, and to have attended private schools (26 and 14 percent) than were theatre or orchestra managers. More than one sixth of the CAA directors grew up in blue-collar families, while fewer than one tenth of museum or orchestra top executives did.

---

[3] On this point, see, e.g., James E. Rosenbaum, "Organizational Career Mobility: Promotion Chances in a Corporation During Periods of Growth and Contraction," *American Journal of Sociology* 85, 1 (July 1979): 21-48.

The vast majority of managers possessed a college degree, and more than half in each field (and almost all art-museum directors) reported pursuing their formal education beyond the baccalaureate. Museum directors reported attending more selective colleges and CAA directors less selective colleges than did theatre and orchestra administrators.[4]

Table 1 illustrates the subjects in which respondents majored while they were in college. The extent to which manager majored in artistic fields related to their later employment (e.g., theatre studies, art history, music, or visual arts) is striking: from 39 percent of CAA directors to 58 percent of art museum directors. Of those who did not, the largest other category was the humanities, including English literature, history, or foreign languages. Relatively few managers in any category majored in education, management, or arts administration as undergraduates.

A number of administrators in the theatre, orchestra, and community arts fields pursued advanced degrees in management; but in no field did the percentage of undergraduate or graduate management-degree holders exceed 15 percent of all respondents. (Only among the theatre managing directors did the number holding arts management degrees approach 10 percent.) Since many of those who sought graduate arts management or management degrees held B.A.s in their field's art form, these findings would tend to refute assertions that arts organizations have been taken over by professional managers, at least in so far as we define "professional" in terms of academic credentials (see Table 2).

---

[4] Respondents were asked to name the college that they had attended, and their responses were coded according to the Astin Index of "College Quality," a measure used widely by researchers in the field of higher education. The Astin Index is as much a selectivity as a quality index. Almost 60 percent of the museum directors but only 24 percent of the CAA directors attended colleges in the highest or next to highest of the Astin Index's seven categories.

Differences Between Male and Female Managers

The most striking difference between men and women in the four fields surveyed is that women tend to administer smaller organizations. For example, more than half of all women art museum directors surveyed were in the lowest-budget 25 percent of museums, while just 18 percent were in the largest 25 percent; for orchestras the comparable proportions were 46 and 5 percent. Dividing each set of managers into thirds on the basis of the year in which they began their first full-time jobs in their fields, we find that women disproportionately were in the "newcomer" third in every discipline except art museums. Although women had less seniority, they were not necessarily younger: Male theatre managers were more likely to be over forty than their female counterparts (41 and 24 percent, respectively), but in art museums and community arts agencies the opposite was true. (Male and female orchestra managers were similar in age.)

In all fields but theatre, families of women managers tended to be higher in social status than were those of male managers. Female orchestra managers were more likely than their male counterparts to have had college-educated parents, especially mothers, and fathers who were businessmen or professionals; and less likely than men (3 percent compared to 17 percent) to have come from families in which the principal wage-earner was a blue-collar worker. Similarly, female art museum directors were more likely than men to have fathers who were top executives or professionals; and women who directed CAAs were more likely to have businessman fathers and less likely to come from blue-collar homes than their male counterparts.

By contrast, in every field but theatre (where there was little difference), male respondents were more highly educated than women.

Male orchestra managers, for example, were more than three times as likely as women to have gone beyond their B.A.s, male museum directors almost seven times as likely to have received doctorates, and male CAA directors one and a half times as likely to have had some graduate training. Male and female managers differed as well in their college major in all fields but art museums: Women theatre managing directors were four times as likely as men to have majored in the humanities (35 and 8 percent, respectively); and while one in seven male managing directors majored in business or arts management, no female managing director reported doing so. In the orchestra field, female managers were also more likely than men to have majored in the humanities (41 and 24 percent) and less likely to have majored in music (54 and 38 percent). In the community arts, a third of the male managers, but just 19 percent of the women, had undergraduate majors in one of the performing arts, while female managers were more likely than male to have majored in education (19 and 4 percent) or the social sciences (20 to 9 percent) than their male counterparts.

Differences by Budget Size

Each set of administrators was divided into four quartiles on the basis of the dollar operating budget of their institutions. The range of budgets in each category in each art form is indicated in Table 3. In each discipline except art museums, more than half of the managers of the least prosperous organizations were women, and their share of managerial positions declined with each increase in budget quartile.

Not surprisingly, managers in the largest institutions tended to have spent more years in their fields than administrators of small organizations. This findings suggests that managers of the smallest organizations have tended either to move to larger organizations or to leave the field. Managers of wealthy institutions also tended to be slightly older than managers of small organizations, a tendency that was strongest among the resident theatres and weakest among the community arts agencies.

Differences by organizational budget size in educational background were strongest among the art museum directors. Directors of the largest art museums were more likely than other directors to have attended private secondary schools, to have attended college in the northeast, and to have earned Ph.D.s. Most striking is the distribution of degrees from a single American university. Almost two of five directors of the largest art museums received an undergraduate or graduate degree from this institution, as did more than a quarter of directors of the next largest museums, but just 5 percent of the directors of smaller art museums.

Differences by Cohort

Many of the most interesting questions about the backgrounds, recruitment and careers of managers have to do with differences among cohorts, i.e. sets of managers who entered employment in their fields during specified periods. Propositions asserting that administrators have changed in recent years can be evaluated by looking at the difference among managers who began their careers in different eras. In the analyses that follow, each population of managers has been divided into thirds, or *cohorts*, on the basis of the year in which the managers took their first full-time jobs in their fields (see Table 4). We then compare the experiences of these cohorts to look at change over time. Such cohort data must be interpreted with caution. Because we shall be using cohort analysis throughout this report, it is important that the reader understand why this is the case.[5]

For one thing, we know that some of the individuals who entered the field along with the oldest cohorts have now left it; and that some of the members of our youngest cohorts will soon be gone. Our data cannot tell us whether the differences that exist between the membership of different cohorts are present because different sets of managers were recruited at different times or because different kinds of managers experience *different rates of attrition* over time.

Second, when we compare cohorts we cannot always distinguish what are called period effects (effects of the era in which a person entered the field) from *aging effects.* For example, we have seen that top executives of wealthy institutions in all of our fields are older than top executives of tiny ones. A visitor from outer space might logically attribute this finding to a "period effect" and conclude that individuals who went into the arts twenty years ago entered major institutions, while people who go into arts management today prefer small ones. But we are more likely to believe that it represents an "aging effect": i.e., as a manager makes a mark on a field, he or she is offered jobs at larger or more prestigious institutions that will not hire inexperienced managers. In distinguishing true cohort effects from the effects of differential attritution or aging, we must go beyond the data and draw on experience, intuition, and common sense.

Finally, the reader should note that the years defined by the cohorts differ from discipline to discipline, depending upon the distribution of entry years in each group of managers. Thus a member of the most senior cohort of CAA directors may have fewer years of experience than a member of the middle cohort of art museum directors. In general, the brief time span of most CAA directors' careers is responsible for a paucity of notable differences among cohorts in that field.

---

[5] For a useful introduction, see Norman Ryder, "The Cohort as a Concept in the Study of Social Change," *American Sociological Review* 30, 6 (1965): 843-61.

Despite these caveats, some striking findings emerge from the analysis of cohort variation among the four populations of arts administrators. Not surprisingly, in each field more senior managers were more likely to command the largest and less likely to manage the smallest organizations than were recent entrants. More notable is the fact that in each discipline the percentage male was lower with each successive cohort. For example, 48 percent of orchestra managers entering the field since 1973 were women, compared to just 15 percent of those taking their first orchestra job before 1964. Similarly, women represented 43 percent of the "newcomer" cohort of resident-theatre managers compared to just 21 percent of the old-timers. These findings are consistent with an increase in opportunities for women in the management of arts organizations. But note that they are also consistent with greater attrition of women managers over time. That is, the data would look as they do if women were doing better (a cohort effect); or if women simply drop out of these fields as they get older (an attrition effect).

Except in the orchestra field, the educational attainment of top managers appears to be increasing over time. Fewer than half of the most senior cohort of theatre managers pursued their educations beyond the B.A., compared to approximately 60 percent of each subsequent cohort. More than a quarter of community arts "old-timers," but fewer than 10 percent of the most recent entrants, lack the B.A.

Increase in educational attainment is most dramatic among the art museum directors: 17 percent of the most senior cohort earned Ph.D.s, compared to 55 percent of recent entrants. Strikingly, the dramatic increase in formal education has been accompanied by a decline in measures of parental social status. Fewer of the most recent cohort (less than one quarter compared to more than two fifths) had guardians who were owners or chief executives of large businesses or professionals; more appear to come from blue-collar and, particularly, middle-class business families. Fewer of the most recent cohort had grandparents born in North America, and far fewer (18 as compared to 47 percent) attended private secondary schools. Thus entry into the museum field seems to have become less strongly related to family background and more directly a product of educational accomplishments. A similar but more modest trend was apparent in the theatre field, as well. The percentage of fathers in the top occupational group declined steadily from cohort to cohort as educational attainment rose.[6]

Recruitment into Arts Administration

A crucial concept in thinking about careers is that of "entry portal."[7] In order to develop a career in a field, an individual must first enter a career track. The opportunities for entry into a field will affect the kinds of individuals who build careers there. Fields with many entry portals will recruit diverse men and women into top positions. Fields with only one entry portal will tend to recruit similar, often well socialized, persons into important jobs. The virtue of routine entry portals is that individuals entering a field have a common past, a common socialization, and common values, and are likely to fit easily into the roles that are available to them.[8] The advantage of multiple entry portals is that talent can be recruited into the field from a wide variety of sources.

---

[6] Note that these findings could result from attrition if directors from higher-status backgrounds stay in the field longer than those from more modest homes. There is no obvious reason to believe that this is the case, however.

[7] See Seymour Spilerman, "Careers, Labor Market Structure, and Socioeconomic Achievement," *American Journal of Sociology* 83, 3 (1977): 551-93.

Each of our four artistic fields is characterized by a multiplicity of entry portals and an absence of fixed credential requirements for employment. Because the experiences of individuals entering the theatre, orchestra, art museum, and the community arts were so different, they will be discussed here in sequence.

First, however, note the differences among the fields in the experience of the managers surveyed (Table 5). In the art museum and orchestra fields, almost half of the top administrators took their first jobs in the field before 1965. By contrast, over half of the theatre managing directors entered theatrical work after 1971. And almost three quarters of the CAA directors began working in community arts agencies after 1975 (although many had worked in the arts before then). Thus the orchestra and art-museum fields have a larger core of veterans than do the resident stage or, especially, the community arts.

Resident Theatre Administrators

Almost half of the theatre managing directors (43 percent) went directly into theatre work from formal schooling, in most cases college. Almost one fifth (18 percent) entered theatrical employment from work in other arts or communications fields (e.g., journalism or art festival management). Another large group (14 percent) taught in primary or secondary schools before taking a theatre job; and about one in ten worked in business.

---

[8] See, e.g., James C. March and James G. March, "Almost Random Careers: The Wisconsin School Superintendency, 1940-1972," *Administrative Science Quarterly* 22, 3 (1977): 377-409.

More than a third of the managing directors were hired directly into top administrative positions, and almost half were promoted to such positions while still with their first employer. Almost half entered the field as subordinate administrative staff (e.g., assistant managing director, marketing director, public relations staff). Fewer than ten percent began their careers as artistic directors or actors, while a similar proportion entered in technical positions like stage manager or set designer.

Male managing directors were more likely than women (21 compared to 7 percent) to get their start in artistic or technical work; while more women than men (37 and 27 percent, respectively) were recruited as interns, administrative assistants, or other management staff. Managers of the largest quartile of resident theatres were less likely to have entered the field as actors or technical staff (9 percent compared to from 14 to 26 percent in the other size categories).

Members of the more junior cohorts were less likely to have been recruited directly from school to their first theatre jobs (30 percent compared to 44 and 56 percent, respectively, for the middle and senior cohorts), and more likely to have apprenticed in other arts or communications fields (30 percent compared to 11 percent for the more senior cohorts). Although these findings suggest that it may have become more difficult to enter theatre work directly from school, it is possible that staff entering from school are likely to stay in the field longer than those with other backgrounds, in which case the data would reflect differential attrition.

Orchestra Managers

Orchestra managers were more likely than theatre managing directors to have entered orchestra work from other artistic or communications fields (39 percent) and less likely (29 percent) to have moved directly from school to orchestra work. They are also more likely (19 percent) to have entered orchestra management from a business career. Of those whose background was in the arts or communications, the largest categories of employment were media or press, elementary or secondary music teaching, and other performing-arts management.

Orchestra managers were less likely than theatre managing directors to have entered the field in artistic positions (just 11 percent began as musicians or conductors) and more likely to begin as top managers (47 percent, with 17 percent more attaining that position with their first employer). Other common entry portals were as interns or assistants (10 percent), marketing or developing directors (9 percent), or other managerial posts (15 percent).

Male and female orchestra managers were similar in their recruitment patterns, except that women were more likely than men (21 and 3 percent, respectively) to have entered as secretaries or special project staff. Only approximately one third of the managers of the two smallest-budget quartiles moved directly into managerships compared to about three fifths of the managers of the larger orchestras. In contrast to the pattern in the resident stage, members of the most junior cohort were more likely to have been recruited to orchestra work from school (38 percent, compared to 23 percent in the more senior cohorts), and less likely to have worked as music teachers (just 3 percent, compared to 22 and 15 percent) or in other kinds of arts management (9 percent compared to 19 and 27 percent).

Art Museum Directors

Art museum directors had more regular entry patterns than managers in other disciplines, entering museum work through schooling (43 percent) or after serving college or university art-history teaching stints (25 percent). The largest group of art museum directors (31 percent) began as curators. Almost one quarter started off as directors, and almost one fifth in such other administrative positions as assistant or associate director. More than half of the men and women recruited from professorial positions into art museum work were first hired as directors; almost half of those recruited from school went into curatorial positions; and the first positions of those recruited from other sources were dispersed among directorships, curatorial positions, educational jobs, and other administrative posts.

Male and female art museum directors were very similar in the occupations from which they were recruited. The same was true of directors of art museums in the four budget quartiles, except that directors of the smallest museums were less likely (17 percent, compared to 40 to 60 percent) to have gone directly from schooling into the art-museum field.

Cohort data are consistent with a change in patterns of recruitment to the art-museum field over time (see Table 6). Recent entrants (Cohort 3) were less likely to have entered museum work directly from school than were members of the other cohorts, the proportion declining over time from 61 percent of the most senior cohort to 21 percent of the most junior. Newcomers are more likely to have been hired as directors to their first art-museum jobs (33 compared to 24 and 14 percent) and less likely to have been hired as curators (23 percent compared to 33 percent in the earlier cohorts).

These findings must be interpreted with caution. We would expect the observed proportion of the recent cohort moving directly into directorial jobs to be higher than the "true" percentage (i.e., the percentage of all persons entering the field during the most recent period who will ever be directors), because individuals who entered recently as curators have had less time to move into the directorial ranks. Similarly, if persons entering museum work directly from school take longer to become directors than persons with professorial experience, this fact might help account for the apparent change.

Nonetheless, two factors suggest that these findings are not entirely artifactual. First, the trends towards greater previous work experience and towards a greater likelihood of entering the field as a director appear between the first and second cohorts, as well as between the second and third. Second, a greater percentage of the current cohort of directors have Ph.D.s and have taught at the university level (53 percent compared to 31 percent of earlier cohorts). It seems likely that along with the trend towards higher educational attainments among museum directors we are also witnessing a trend towards more university teaching experience and shorter periods in the field before attainment of a first directorship.

Community Arts Agency Directors

In comparison to the other fields, pre-entry positions and entry portals were most diverse among the CAA directors, with no evidence that routine forms of recruitment had developed. About one third of the CAA directors went directly from school into artistic or arts-administrative work of some kind; of other sources of recruitment into the arts, only nonprofit management accounts for more than 10 percent of the directors' pre-recruitment positions. The first arts jobs of almost half of the directors were in the community arts field, with another 13 percent employed in performing arts organizations and just under a tenth each in museums or galleries, or state or municipal arts agencies.

Only 10 percent of the CAA directors, far fewer than the top managers in other fields, went directly from school to the community arts. Just over 40 percent entered community arts work from other arts or media organizations, with the rest scattered among a wide range of pursuits. For over 80 percent of the CAA directors, their first job in the community arts was a directorship, and nearly all became directors while still with their first community-arts employer.

Male directors were more likely to have taken a job in the arts directly after graduation than were their female counterparts (46 to 27 percent), more likely to have been recruited from theatre management (21 to 12 percent), and less likely to have served as volunteers (5 to 23 percent), worked in the press or media (11 to 24 percent), as teachers (14 to 27 percent), or in secretarial or clerical jobs (4 to 22 percent). Managerial backgrounds differed neither by budget category nor by cohort.

Thus the artistic fields studied here are more likely to enjoy the benefits of diversity of background than of consistent preparation and socialization. Each draws many eventual managers directly from school, and few from business management. In each of these fields, individuals with little or no experience in the field commonly become top managers, usually of small organizations.

Managerial Careers

In some fields (e.g., medicine, government service, university teaching) recruits are aware of a number of conventional, sometimes mandatory, steps that, if taken, will lead to positions of power and prestige. In other fields, the paths of achievement are less apparent and well trodden. As arts administrators vary in the manner in which they are recruited into their fields, so they vary in their careers subsequent to recruitment.

In each of the four fields, approximately 10 percent of the top executives have worked for more than four employers during their careers.[9] Between one half and two thirds in each field have worked for only one or two employers. Art museum directors and theatre managing directors tended to have the longest spells of employment: 30 percent of the art museum directors and more than a fifth of the theatre managing directors had been with their current employers for over ten years (see Table 7). Orchestra managers are comparable to theatre administrators in their tenure, while just 5 percent of CAA directors had worked for for more than ten years for their current employers. Most respondents were hired into their current administrative positions: only about a quarter of the theatre, orchestra, and art-museum executives, and just 14 percent of the CAA directors had been promoted internally to their current job.

Careers culminated in top managerial positions most quickly in the community arts field, where 82 percent of directors served no apprenticeship in the community arts before taking on a directorship, and least rapidly among the orchestras, where almost half waited longer than five years and almost a quarter for more than ten years before becoming a manager.

Theatre managing directors were promoted youngest, with 43 percent becoming executives before turning thirty, and all but 10 percent were first employed as managing directors before their fortieth birthday.

---

[9] Unless otherwise specified, in this section "careers" refers to the career of a manager in his or her field, and does not include unrelated jobs prior to recruitment.

(Although CAA directors served shorter, if any, apprenticeships, they tended to have longer work experience outside the field than their counterparts in the resident stage.) By contrast, just 24 percent of the orchestra managers and 14 percent of the art-museum directors reported an executive position before age thirty, while almost a third of the former and more than a quarter of the latter assumed their first top managership after turning forty. Few managers in any field had held more than two executive positions, suggesting that job-hopping is uncommon among those who have attained top managerships.

Managers' work experience before attaining their position at the time of the survey varied from field to field, and was diverse even within fields. In theatres, substantial minorities had experience as actors, artistic directors, "techies," commercial theatre or summer stock administrators, college, university, primary or secondary teachers, or public arts agency employees. But none of these categories included even a third of all of the managing directors surveyed. Relatively few managing directors had direct experience in theatre marketing, development, and public relations, nor had many managed other performing-arts organizations or worked in non-arts-related businesses.

Female managing directors were more likely than their male counterparts to have had experience in theatre public relations (20 percent to 9 percent), marketing or audience development (13 to 3 percent), and fund-raising or development (23 to 3 percent); to have taught primary or secondary school (23 to 12 percent); and to have worked in commercial theatre (33 to 15 percent). By contrast, men were more likely to have worked in a public arts agency (21 to 7 percent).

Managing directors of the two smallest budget quartiles were more likely than those of larger theatres to have worked in theatre public relations, marketing, or development (23 and 38 percent, respectively, compared to 7 and 9 percent). Managing directors in the smallest quartiles were more likely than those in larger ones to have worked as actors, directors, or technical staff (77 percent compared to 38 to 44 percent in the other quartiles). Managers in the largest-budget quartile were more likely than their peers to have worked in public arts agencies (24 to 9 percent) and summer stock (39 percent compared to 8 to 18 percent).

Analysis of inter-cohort variation suggests striking apparent changes in managerial work experience over time (Table 8). The percentage of managing directors with experience in public relations, development or marketing - three key management functions involving the theatre's external environment - increased steadily with each cohort, from 7 percent of the most senior managing directors to 33 percent of the most junior. By contrast, the percentage involved in artistic or production work declined modestly but steadily (from 57 to 40 percent), as did the percentages with experience in commercial theatre (29 to 10 percent), summer stock (29 to 7 percent), and college teaching (25 to 7 percent). It is possible that these last three findings represent age effects (because managing directors may gain commercial-theatre, summer-stock, or college-teaching experience after they have already become involved with the resident stage). By contrast, it is unlikely that administrators become actors or development directors after having been managing directors.

The same diversity in experience was apparent among orchestra-manager respondents. More than one fifth had worked as musicians, almost a fifth had experience in non-arts businesses, and more than 10 percent had worked as elementary/secondary teachers, for artists agencies, or in other performing-arts management positions. Male managers were more likely than female managers to have been musicians (25 to 10 percent) or to have managed a for-profit business (20 to 6 percent). Managers of the largest-budget quartile were less likely than others to have worked as elementary or secondary school teachers (7 percent compared to 24 percent of managers of the smallest orchestras) and less likely to have worked as orchestra musicians. By contrast, the percentage of managers having worked in opera, dance or theatre management ascended with size, from 4 percent among managers of the smallest orchestras to 22 percent among managers of the largest. The percentage of managers with work experience in orchestra development, public relations, or marketing rose as well, from 4 percent in the smallest orchestras to 22 percent in the largest.

Like the resident theatres, the orchestras appear to have experienced a decline in the percentage of managers with artistic experience and an increase, albeit modest, in the percentage with business and managerial experience from cohort to cohort. More than one fifth of the most senior managers compared to less than one tenth of the members of the most junior cohort had been orchestra musicians, while from 18 percent of the senior cohort to just 3 percent of the "newcomers" had taught music in elementary or secondary schools. By contrast almost one quarter of the most junior managers, compared to 15 percent of their more senior counterparts, reported non-arts business experience; and 15 percent of the junior, but just 9 percent of the senior cohort had worked in orchestra public relations, development, or marketing.[10]

---

[10] In all cases, the percentage of the middle-cohort managers lies between that for the most and least senior.

Compared to theatre and orchestra careers, art-museum directors' experiences were relatively routine; yet even here, no kind of work experience leading to a directorship was shared by even half of the respondents. The most common prior experience was curatorship, reported by 44 percent of the directors. Almost as many (38 percent) had taught art at the college or university level. Smaller groups had worked as associate or assistant directors, in art museum education departments, or as elementary or secondary school teachers. Surprisingly, fully 20 percent reported being employed, at some point during their work careers, in a business unrelated to the arts.

The relatively few women directors were more likely than men to have worked for nonprofit organizations outside the arts, as elementary or high school teachers, or in clerical museum positions, and less likely (17 to 37 percent) to have worked in non-arts businesses. Directors of the smallest museums were more likely to have served as professors before entering museum work (45 percent compared to 27 percent for directors of the largest museums), to have been elementary or secondary teachers (21 and 13 percent for the two smallest-budget qurtiles, about 4 percent for the largest two); or to have worked as museum educators (10 and 27 percent in the two smallest quartiles compared to 7 percent for directors of the larger museums).

Table 9 displays inter-cohort variation in director work experience. Strikingly, 48 percent of the most junior cohort but only 6 percent of the most senior directors had taught at the university level before going into museum works. Also striking was the decline in the percentage of directors with curatorial experience, from 58 to 35 percent, suggesting that acquisition of a Ph.D. may have come to replace curatorial service as preparation for art-museum directorships. Finally, in contrast to the findings for the performing arts, the percentage of directors with business experience outside the arts appears to have declined.

The experience of community arts agency directors was the most diverse of all of the respondents. Because most of them took on directorships as their first positions in the field, no internal position prepared a large share of directors for their work. Nor, as we have seen, are there regular recruitment channels. Between 8 and 20 percent of the CAA directors reported experience in each of the following work spheres: primary and secondary teaching (21 percent), university arts management (16 percent), arts service organization employment and secretarial/clerical work (14 percent each), teaching in a school of the arts (13 percent), theatre management or work as a performing artist (12 percent each), employment in a commercial arts venture (11 percent), experience as a visual artist or in orchestra management (10 percent), work in an arts center (9 percent) or in a non-arts business (8 percent). No major differences between genders, among directors of agencies in different budget categories, or among members of different cohorts were visible.

Conclusions

The careers we have described in this chapter are relatively unroutinized and idiosyncratic. Yet some general conclusions can be drawn.

First, the managers of our larger resident theatres, orchestras, art museums, and local arts agencies were, as a group, men and women from families of relatively high social status. Women were present in large numbers in every field but the art museums. But in each field they were more likely than men to be located in smaller, less prestigious institutions.

Educational levels of these managers were high - more than half have pursued their formal educations past college - and seem to have been going up, dramatically among art-museum directors and more gradually among others. If formal educational credentials and prior experience are a guide, the managers' arts backgrounds were rather strong while their management experience was meager. Nonetheless, there were numerous exceptions to both of these assertions, and some evidence that management training and experience are becoming more common and artistic experience somewhat rarer among performing-arts managers, especially theatre managing directors.

Cohort analysis suggested that each field had been changing in distinctive ways, with the exception of community arts agencies, the directors of which were, for the most part, such recent entrants into the field that few conclusions could be drawn about change.

Art museums have undergone professionalization, in the sense that their directors, especially those of the largest institutions, have increasingly impressive educational credentials and increasingly commonplace social backgrounds. University teaching experience was more common in the recent cohort than among previous entrants to the field, and curatorship appears to have undergone a concommitant decline as a stepping-stone to the directorship.

Among the resident theatres, artistic expertise has become somewhat less common and managerial training more common among managing directors. Similar, although less notable, trends were apparent among orchestra managers.

Careers, that is, ordered sequences of jobs leading from conventional entry portals to predictable destinations, do not exist in these fields.

(Indeed, careers, in practice, are far less common than most people believe.)[11] Arts managers are recruited from many sources and bring with them a panoply of experiences. Many entrants move directly into top executive positions. Mobility within organizations is limited by size: relatively few arts institutions have enough levels of management to promote routinely all competent personnel. And movement among organizations, at the executive level, would seem to be less common than widespread perceptions of "job-hopping" would suggest.

The disorderly nature of managerial careers in these artistic fields may provide opportunities for organizations to hire talented individuals from unusual backgrounds and for individuals willing to take risks to build successful careers. But many people find it stressful to work in environments in which promotion opportunities are few and career strategies obscure and poorly understood. Such individuals, if they face career stagnation or uncertainty, may choose to leave arts administration for other pursuits. In the chapter that follows, we shall consider the rewards that arts administrators receive, the satisfactions they express, and their expectations about the future.

---

[11] Seymour Spilerman, "Careers, Labor Market Structure, and Socioeconomic Achievement," *American Journal of Sociology* 83, 3 (1977): 551-93.

TABLE 1: COLLEGE MAJORS

	THEATRE	MUSEUM	ORCHESTRA	CAA
Art Form*	49.45%	57.98	47.37	38.92%
Humanities	29.67	30.25	26.32	25.93
Management	5.49	0.00	10.53	5.56
Arts Management	3.30	0.00	1.05	0.93
Social Science**	9.89	7.56	11.58	25.93
Science	2.20	4.20	3.16	2.78
N	91	119	95	108

*Theatre, Art, Music, and any art form, respectively
**Includes pre-professional majors (excluding pre-med)

TABLE 2: MASTERS DEGREE MAJORS

	THEATRE	MUSEUM	ORCHESTRA	CAA
Art Form*	54.76%	82.11	43.18	44.44
Humanities	9.52	10.53	18.18	9.26
Management	9.52	2.11	18.18	11.11
Arts Management	23.81	2.11	9.09	14.81
Social Science**	2.38	3.16	9.09	18.52
Science	0.00	0.00	2.27	1.85
N	42	95	44	54

*Theatre, Art, Music, and any art form, respectively
**Includes pre-professional majors (excluding pre-med)

TABLE 3: BUDGET RANGES BY CATEGORY AND DISCIPLINE (in thousands)

Discipline	Lowest quartile	2nd quartile	3rd quartile	Top quartile
Theatres	less than $260	$260-$500	$501-$1200	more than $1200
Orchestras	less than $320	$320-$700	$701-$1699	more than $1699
Art Museums	less than $501	$501-$999	$1000-$1999	more than $1999
CAAs	less than $50	$51-$100	$101-$299	more than $300

TABLE 4: MEANING OF COHORT CATEGORIES FOR EACH DISCIPLINE (FIRST YEAR OF FIRST JOB IN FIELD)

Discipline	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 3
Theatres	Before 1967	1967-1974	After 1974
Orchestras	Before 1964	1964-1973	After 1973
Art Museums	Before 1963	1963-1968	After 1968
CAAs*	Before 1976	1976-1978	After 1978

*First full-time job in the arts.

TABLE 5: FIRST YEAR OF FIRST FULL-TIME JOB IN FIELD BY DISCIPLINE*

Year	Theatre	Museum	Orchestra	CAA1*	CAA2*
Pre-1960	11.96%	24.57	23.00	0.80	7.44
1960-65	16.30	20.34	19.00	2.42	7.44
1966-70	16.30	33.90	20.00	3.23	18.18
1971-75	34.80	16.95	19.00	21.77	25.62
Post-1975	20.65	4.24	19.00	71.77	41.32
N	92	118	100	124	121

*CAA1 refers to first CAA job; CAA2 refers to first job in arts.

TABLE 6: PERCENTAGE IN EACH COHORT OF ART-MUSEUM DIRECTORS (1) ENTERING MUSEUM WORK DIRECTLY FROM SCHOOLING; (2) ENTERING INTO DIRECTORIAL POSITION; (3) ENTERING INTO CURATORIAL POSITION (1=Most senior, 3=Most junior)

Cohort	(1)	(2)	(3)	N
1	61.11	13.89	33.33	36
2	40.48	23.81	33.33	42
3	20.51*	32.50	22.50	40

*N=39

TABLE 7: NUMBER OF YEARS WITH CURRENT EMPLOYER

	0-2	3-5	6-10	More Than 10	N
Theatre	21.51%	32.26	23.65	22.58	93
Museum	13.68	21.37	35.04	29.91	117
Orchestra	22.77	35.64	23.76	17.82	101
CAA	30.65	36.23	28.23	4.84	124

TABLE 8: MANAGERIAL EXPERIENCES BY COHORT - THEATRES

Variable	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 3
Theatre public relations	7.14%	5.88	26.67
Theatre development	0.00	5.88	20.00
Theatre marketing	0.00	2.94	16.67
Any of the above	7.14	14.71	33.33
Actor, artistic director or technical worker	57.14	47.06	40.00
Commercial theatre	28.57	23.53	10.00
Summer stock	28.57	26.47	6.67
College or university teaching	25.00	23.53	6.67
N	28	34	30

TABLE 9: MANAGERIAL EXPERIENCES BY COHORT - ART MUSEUMS

Variable	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 3
College or university teaching before museum	5.54%	23.81	47.50
Ever taught college or university	30.56	30.95	52.50
Associate Director	19.44	14.29	2.50
Curatorial experience	58.33	40.48	35.00
Non-Arts business	22.22	23.81	12.50
N	36	42	40

CHAPTER 3: REWARDS AND EXPECTATIONS

We focus on three kinds of rewards in the pages that follow. The first is income, which is a powerful incentive for continued participation in any field. Second, we examine the resources that our respondents commanded, as represented by the budgets of their institutions. Third, we shall consider, as well, satisfactions the administrators reported deriving from a range of other sources: autonomy; relationships with subordinates, colleagues at other institutions, artists, trustees, government agencies, donors, and works of art; the role they played in their communities; and opportunities for career development. Finally, we shall look at responses to questions about career expectations: how likely respondents believed they were to take a similar job in a larger institution or in one like their own; to work as artists, in government, or in the commercial media; or to leave the arts altogether.

Salary and Resources

We shall consider salary and resources together. Salary was related to the employing organization's operating budget in every field, very highly in the performing arts (correlation of approximately .70) and more modestly (approximately .30) in art museums and community arts agencies (CAAs).[1]

Table 1 indicates the distribution of administrators' annual salaries in each of the four fields. Over half of the orchestra managers and 86 percent of the art museum directors earned more than $27,500, compared to fewer than one third of the theatre managing directors and just 21 percent of the CAA directors. Similarly, art museum and orchestra administrators commanded more resources (mean budgets of $1.9 and $1.8 million, respectively) than theatre managing directors (with an average budget of $954,000) and CAA directors (average budget $354,000).[2]

---

[1] The lower correlation of salary with budget size in the art-museum population is partly an artifact of the restricted upper category of the salary scale on the survey, which requested respondents to check the range in which their salary fell. It may also result from the inclusion of directors of university art museums, whose salaries, in some cases, were tied to university-teaching scales. Similarly, the salaries of directors of municipal CAAs may have been constrained by municipal salary scales.

Male managers administered larger organizations and were better paid than women managers in every field. Among the resident-theatre respondents, for example, 45 percent of the men but just 3 percent of the women earned more than $27,500 annually. Distributions were similar, although less extreme, in other fields. We shall consider the extent to which these differences can be explained by differences in the backgrounds, educational attainments, or career experiences of male and female administrators below.

Similarly, managers in more senior cohorts directed larger organizations and earned more than more recent entrants in every field. As we have seen, administrators of larger organizations also earned more generous salaries.

Thus in each of these fields, directors of large organizations earn more than managers of small ones; women earn less than men; and experienced managers earn more than inexperienced ones. In addition, theatre managing directors with degrees in management and without experience in theatre marketing, development, or public relations departments; art museum directors with Ph.D.s in art history and any degree from one major American university; and CAA directors with arts degrees and prior arts experience are all better paid than their counterparts without these attributes.

---

[2] In all cases, means are inflated by the presence of a few atypical organizations with exceptionally high budgets.

Note that these observations describe associations, not causal relationships. They tell us nothing about how one might alter these associations. Take, for example, the finding that women earn less money than men. If this is a consequence of the fact that women managers are less well educated than men, it could be changed by providing training to female arts administrators. If it results from the fact that women are less experienced, than the difference should moderate with time, at least if male and female recruits are equally likely to remain in their fields. If the difference exists because women work for smaller employers than do men, then the problem lies in the nature of women's careers and large organizations' hiring patterns. If similar organizations pay women less than they would pay men with the same talents and credentials, then the legal remedies available to women in any field might be employed.

To begin to distinguish the causes of the variation we observe, we employ a statistical technique known as multiple regression analysis. This technique allows us to investigate the effects of each independent variable on an outcome while simultaneously controlling for each one. For example, a multiple regression analysis of the impact of rainfall, sunshine, and fertilizer on the height of tomato plants would permit us to estimate the effect of each factor over and above that of all the others.

Let us first consider the predictors of budget size. The budget that a manager commands is an important source of reward in its own right and is related, as well, to salary, especially in the performing arts. Results of multiple regression analyses of the predictors of operating budget size in dollars are displayed in Table 3.[3]

In all but the art museum field, being a woman (GEN) was negatively associated with budget size, even after controlling for family background, education, and career experience. This tendency for women to administer smaller organizations than men of comparable background, training, and experience was particularly strong in the resident-theatre field, but notable as well among orchestras and community arts agencies.

The effects of family background were are small in all fields, although parent's educational attainment has a modest positive effect on budget size for orchestra managers and a modest but surprising negative net association with the budgets that art-museum directors command.[4] Managers who attended private secondary schools (a measure of family social status) administer larger budgets, other things equal, in all four fields.[5] Orchestra managers who attended more selective colleges administer larger organizations. By contrast, years of education bears a surprising negative relationship to the budget size of CAA directors' agencies, even controlling for years in the field. Notably, the major influence on the budget commanded by art museum directors is having attended a single major American university.

---

[3] The left hand column of Table 3 includes a list of independent variables used to predict the outcome in question. These are defined in Table 2. Results for each field are summarized in two columns under the name of that field. For each field the right-hand column contains the *standardized beta coefficient* for each of the variables included in the equation presented in the table. This coefficient is a number ranging from -1 to +1 that indicates the extent to which the independent variable is associated with the dependent variable after controlling for the effects of all other variables in the equation. For purposes of the comparison, the simple correlation (also ranging from -1 to +1) is displayed in the column headed "r" to the left of the regression-coefficient column. This statistic indicates the degree of association between independent and dependent variables when other variables are *not* held constant. Not all variables are included in all the equations for each field. Variables are excluded when they proved (in analyses not reported here) to have no important effects on the dependent variable or other results in the analyses; when they were too closely associated with other independent variables to disentangle their effects (e.g., age and seniority for some fields); or when measures were only applicable to certain fields (e.g., curatorial experience).

[4] Note that the term "effect" refers to "statistical effect" rather than to causality. Although such findings are consistent with the existence of real effects, they do not in themselves prove their existence.

Apsects of age and seniority have strong positive net effects on budget size in every field except the art museums. Years worked before entering the field has an important influence on budget sizes of CAA directors' agencies, as does years of work experience. For orchestra and theatre administrators, years of experience in the field is a powerful net predictor of organization budget.

Table 4 displays results of regression analyses of managers' salaries in our four fields. Budget size is by far the most important predictor of salary among the theatre and orchestra managers, exerts an improtant influence on the salaries of CAA directors, and a more modest, but still notable, net effect on art museum directors' salaries as well.

Salaries are also influenced by the experience of administrators in the arts and in their fields. Years of work experience is a very powerful predictor of salary in the performing arts and only slightly less so among the CAA directors. A closely related measure, years of experience in the arts, is an important predictor of art-museum directors' salaries as well. Surprisingly, holding experience constant, managers of orchestras (but not in other fields) who reported long tenures with their current employers earned substantially less than managers with briefer tenures.

---

[5] For the sake of brevity, the phrases "other things equal," "net effects," and "controlling for other factors" will not be included in every sentence in the report of regression results. The reader should note, however, that unless otherwise indicated, descriptions of regression-analysis results all refer to net associations, i.e., controlling for the influences of other measured factors.

The impact of educational experience varies in importance from the art museum field, where it is crucial, to the orchestra field, where no indicators of educational experience have a notable influence on salary. Attending a single American university has a notable influence on the salary of art-museum directors, though somewhat less of an influence that years of educational attainment. In the museum field, then, the income determination process appears to have components of both meritocracy and old school ties.

Among CAA directors, educational attainment is a strong predictor of salary, on a par with budget size and years of experience. Thus educational attainment has mixed effects in this group, with a direct positive impact on salary, but an indirect negative impact through its negative effect on operating budget.

Finally, having attended a private secondary school is a moderately strong predictor of the salaries of theatre managing directors. Graduates of private schools are doubly advantaged here: They are more likely to administer large theatres (and thus to benefit from the strong relationship between budget size and earnings) and, holding budget constant, still earn more money than similar men and women who attended public schools.

Family background has no direct effect on the incomes of theatre managing directors, unless private-school attendance is seen as a measure of family social standing. Among the orchestra managers, parental educational attainment is negatively associated with income, an impact that is balanced by the positive impact of parental education on organizational size. A similar negative impact of family social standing, once educational experiences are controlled, appears in the art-museum field, in which parental social class is negatively associated with income. These negative associations are puzzling. It is possible that individuals from humble backgrounds who attain advanced degrees, attend major universities, and become art museum directors or orchestra managers have unmeasured qualities that enable them to enter what traditionally have been elite jobs, and also to earn higher salaries once they occupy them. Finally, CAA directors from top business or professional families earn higher salaries than comparable directors from more modest backgrounds.

One of the most striking similarities among the four fields is the negative impact of gender on earnings for managers in each of them. Although introducing controls for family background, educational and career experience, and organizational budget size reduces the negative impact of being female by one third for art-museum directors, one half for CAA chiefs, and lmost two thirds for theatre and orchestra managing directors, the effects that remain are notable, and similar across the four fields. Because women also tend, other things equal, to direct organizations with smaller budgets, they are doubly disadvantaged. Unless men and women managers in these fields differ on some unmeasured traits that are uncorrelated with family background, educational experience, career experience, or organizational budget size (a possibility that seems unlikely), it is difficult to escape the conclusion that women top administrators of the organizations we studied earn less money than do comparable men.

Intrinsic Rewards: Work Satisfaction

If salary and command over resources were the only factors that motivated people, we would expect resident theatres and local arts agencies to have a more difficult time attracting and retaining capable managers than orchestras and art museums. But if managers compare their organizations and salaries chiefly to those of peers in their fields rather than to those in the arts more generally, these factors may be offset by other satisfactions intrinsic to the work of managing the arts.

To tap such satisfactions, we asked respondents to rate the satisfaction they derived from a set of factors intrinsic to their work, as well as from their salaries. These ratings were made on a five-point scale, on which "5" represented "a source of great satisfaction" and "1" represented "a source of great dissatisfaction." Thus those factors that arouse apathy or ambivalence among respondents are rated "3," while ratings lower than "3" indicate irritants rather than satisfactions. Table 5 lists the job attributes about which respondents were asked, along with the abbreviated name that will be used in the table to follow. Table 6 indicates for each set of managers and each satisfaction the mean; the rank of this mean among all factors for the group (in parenthesis after the mean); the percentage who indicated satisfaction ("4" or "5"); the percentage who indicated *dis*satisfaction ("1" or "2"); and the number of respondents.

Overall, administrators in different fields responded similarly to the questions. Managers in each field found more sources of satisfaction than of dissatisfaction on the list. If we consider a mean of 3.51 or higher to indicate satisfaction and of 2.49 or lower to represent dissatisfaction, none of the factors were on balance sources of dissatisfaction, and only salary (for all but art museum directors), contacts with donors (for theatre managing directors and CAA directors), and contact with government agencies (for all) were not described as sources of satisfaction. Administrators in all fields reported much satisfaction in their autonomy and authority and in their relationships with colleagues, their relationships with subordinates, and their contact with works of art. Managers in each field reported relatively less satisfaction with their salaries and with contacts with trustees, donors, and, particularly, government agencies. While managers in each field were relatively positive about opportunities for career development, in no field did they include such opportunities among the top half of all satisfactions.

Thus the satisfactions that keep managers in their fields and the dissatsifactions that make their work less rewarding would seem similar from field to field. Theatre managing directors enjoyed their contacts with subordinates, artists, and colleagues, their contact with works of art, and their roles in their communities. Orchestra managers appreciated their autonomy and authority, their contact with works of art, their community roles, and their contacts with colleagues and artists. Art museum directors found satisfaction in their contacts with works of art, their autonomy and authority, their contacts with colleagues and subordinates, and their roles in the community. Community art agency directors likewise cited their community roles, their autonomy and authority, and relationships with subordinates and colleagues as sources of reward. Not surprisingly, the better paid orchestra and art-museum administrators were more likely to find satisfaction in their salaries than were their counterparts in resident theatres and community arts agencies. Orchestra managers were slightly less enthusiastic about their subordinates than were respondents in other fields. Managers in the performing arts found more satisfaction in contacts with artists than those in museums and community arts agencies, probably because they had more regular contact with them. Community arts agency directors were less likely to report satisfaction in contacts with works of art, probably because they have less contact.

One might consider as troublesome those job attributes noted as sources of dissatisfaction by 10 percent or more of the respondents in a field. More than a quarter of the theatre managing directors cited their salaries as a source of dissatisfaction, and almost 30 percent rated contacts with donors negatively. Contacts with government (20 percent) and with board members (14 percent) were also sources of dissatisfaction in the resident-theatre field.

A similar pattern emerged from the responses of the community arts agency directors. Almost a quarter cited contacts with government agencies as an irritant.[6] Low ratings were given by some to contacts with board members (11 percent) and with donors (13 percent). Perhaps more significant, however, were the relatively high percentages (20 and 18 percent, respectively) dissatisfied with their salaries and their opportunities for career growth. It is possible that the absence of conventional career sequences in the community arts is, as suggested in chapter 2, a source of anxiety to administrators in this field.

By comparison with the theatre and CAA administrators, orchestra and art-museum administrators were well satisfied. Just over one tenth of the orchestra managers expressed dissatisfaction with their salaries and 29 percent evaluated negatively their contacts with government agencies. For art museum directors, contacts with government agencies were the only notable source of dissatisfaction, with just over one quarter citing them adversely.

---

[6] Because of the special relationships between many local arts agency directors and their municipal governments the results are not completely comparable for CAA directors and other respondents. More generally, without comparable questions regarding contacts with private foundations and corporations, it is difficult to interpret the relatively negative response to government, particularly since it is unclear which agencies (federal, state, local, or survey-toting recipients of federal grants) respondents had in mind.

Variation in Satisfaction Between Men and Women

Male and female theatre managing directors were similar in their responses, although men were much more satisfied with their (higher) salaries and slightly more satisfied with their community roles, while women were slightly more satisfied with their opportunities for career development and more likely to be dissatisfied with their autonomy and authority. Male and female orchestra managers diverged in their responses, with males reporting more satisfaction from their salaries, their autonomy and authority, their community roles, and their contacts with works of art; and women expressing more satisfaction with their relationships with colleagues, contacts with board members, and opportunities for career development.

Male and female art museum directors also responded differently to these questions, although the small number of women in this field makes generalization hazardous. Male art museum directors were more likely to express satisfaction with their salaries, while women reported greater satisfaction with their contacts with artists, board members, donors, government agencies, and with their community roles. Women were less likely to express dissatisfaction than men with their opportunities for career development. Women CAA directors reported more satisfaction than their male counterparts in each area in which differences emerged. They were more likely to express satisfaction than males about their relations with colleagues in other institutions, their contacts with board members, their community roles, and their contacts with works of art. They were less likely to report contacts with government agencies as a source of dissatisfaction.

Variation in Satisfaction by Cohort

Interpretation of cohort differences in responses to attitude questions is treacherous for several reasons. For one thing, members of the most senior cohort in each field are survivors; less satisfied managers who entered their fields along with them may have dropped out before reaching their level of seniority. Second, some attitudes change with age and experience. If we were to survey individuals in the junior cohort in fifteen years, those that remained might provide responses more similar to the current members of the most experienced cohort than they do now. Differences among cohorts, then, may result from the recruitment of individuals with stable attitudes into the field at different times; to differences in age and experience that will moderate with time; or to the winnowing out of less satisfied members of more senior cohorts who have left the field.

In general, newer entrants to all four fields expressed less satisfaction than men and women in more senior cohorts. On most indicators, members of the most senior cohorts were more likely to report satisfaction than those of less senior cohorts. Where substantial minorities of the most recent entrants did not find satisfaction in many of the intrinsic qualities of their jobs, we may expect that many of them will not be retained in the field for the duration of their working lives. Where contacts outside the employing organization were perceived as more satisfying than those within, as seemed to be the case (relatively speaking) for the most recent cohort of art museum directors and the middle cohort of CAA directors, some administrators may find themselves focussing more on activities in the profession than on local organizational dilemmas. Although in none of these fields was satisfaction with career-development opportunities so low among newcomers as to lead us to predict a mass exodus, in each of the fields studied the combination of satisfactions and dissatisfactions seems likely to lead a minority of younger top administrators to leave the field in years to come.

Variation in Satisfaction by Organization Size

Organization budget size was positively associated with the tendency to express satisfaction with intrinsic qualities of the occupational role among theatre managing directors, but not among other respondents. For the orchestra managers and CAA directors, the relationship between size and satisfaction varied depending upon the specific trait. In the art-museum field, directors of small institutions tended to report the highest degrees of satisfaction overall. In all fields but the resident stage, managers of the largest institutions derived the least satisfaction from contacts with artists.

In all fields but theatre, but especially orchestras and the community arts, managers of the largest organizations tended to be less satisfied than others with their opportunities for career advancement. This finding suggests that some managers who have been very successful may be frustrated once they have reached the top of their professions. Such fields may find it difficult to retain able administrators who attain top administrative positions early in their careers.

Taken together, the results suggested that, outside of the theatre at least, intrinsic rewards may compensate for income in the smaller organizations, while relatively high salaries induce individuals to manage the largest organizations, despite the fact that they find the intrinsic qualities of these jobs less rewarding than do managers of smaller organizations.

Variation in Satisfaction by Work Experience

Analyses of differences in satisfaction among managers within each field who have had different career experiences suggests that satisfaction and career experience are related, but that the relationships are shaped by local conditions in each field. Among theatre managing directors, possession of an arts degree was associated with greater satisfaction with works of art, but not with artists. Among orchestra managers, holding a music degree was associated with deriving greater satisfaction from artists, but not from works of art. Among art-museum directors, possession of an advanced degree in art history was negatively associated with satisfaction derived both from artists and from works of art. In the community arts agencies, educational backgrounds did not seem to influence satisfaction at all.

Similar variation was evident between managers in different fields who did and did not possess experience in the arts or in arts management, respectively, before assuming their first directorships. Differing results in different fields do not mean that shifts in the backgrounds of arts managers cannot or have not had profound or consistent effects on what managers seek from and value in their jobs. But they do suggest that, given the range of variation among the managers surveyed, explanations of these relationships must be sought in developments specific to each field.

Career Expectations

If arts organizations are to be well administered it is not enough for them to recruit talented individuals into administrative positions. The field as a whole must retain these individuals as they become more experienced and develop greater skills.

In this section we analyze the responses of managers to questions about their expectations about future career movement. Although people do not always do what they expect to do (unforeseen opportunities arise, attitudes change, plans undergo sudden shifts), such questions provide a more direct measure than do satisfaction reports of the directions in which administrators think they are heading.

Each set of managers were asked to indicate the likelihood that they would in the future take each of several kinds of jobs. They indicated this by circling one number on a four-point scale of which "4" equalled "very likely" and "1" equalled "very unlikely."[7] The alternatives posed varied for each set of administrators, based on the nature of their work and experience. The alternatives, abbreviations used in the table to follow, and the fields for which the alternatives were posed are described in Table 7. In the discussion that follows, particular attention will be paid to respondents' evaluations of the likelihood that they will, first, take jobs in larger or more prestigious organizations in their fields and, second, move to a position unrelated to the arts. The former expectation is most consistent with a commitment to one's discipline and to an optimistic view of one's opportunities in it. The latter is most directly related to our concern with retention of managers in the arts.

Table 8 displays the mean response to each expectation question for each field and the percentage of administrators in each field who responded that each alternative was either "very likely" or "somewhat likely." Managers in all fields were remarkably similar in their expectations about taking jobs similar to their current ones or administering larger or more prestigious institutions. Just over half of the managers in each field (from 53 percent of the orchestra managers to 62 percent of the art-museum directors) expected to move to a similar organization. Approximately two thirds of the managers in each field (from 62 percent of the CAA directors to 68 percent of the orchestra managers) expected to command a larger or more prestigious organization in their field.

---

[7] For the purpose of data analyses, the numbering of categories in the survey instruments, in which "1"=very likely and "4"=very unlikely, has been reversed.

By contrast, fields varied more in the percentages of managers who expected to take positions outside the arts. More than half of the CAA directors expected to leave the arts, compared to approximately one third of the managers of theatres, orchestras, and art museums. There are several reasons why the local arts agencies are more at risk than other fields of losing many of their managers to other pursuits. First, CAA directors were newer to their fields than were their counterparts in other disciplines. Consequently, they had had less time to build a web of commitments to the field. Second, careers in the community arts were even less structured, and thus more uncertain, than those in the other fields considered here. Third, CAA directors commanded smaller organizations than the managers responding in other fields and earned relatively low salaries as well. In the long run, the development of a larger cadre of experienced managers and the routinization of careers should moderate the difference between local arts agencies and other kinds of arts organization. In the short run, however, departure of administrative talent seems likely to be a vexing problem for local arts agencies.

Managers can leave administrative positions in their fields without leaving the arts altogether. Responses to questions about career possibilities outside administration in the managers' current fields also reflected the vulnerable position of community arts agencies, revealed tensions in the resident stage, and indicated relative stability among the art museums. For example, 68 percent of the CAA directors who responded and 40 percent of the theatre managing directors, but just 23 percent of the art museum directors and 31 percent of orchestra managers thought it likely that they would take jobs with public agencies concerned with the arts. Fully one half of the CAA directors expected to administer other kinds of arts organizations, compared to fewer than one quarter of the theatre managing directors. Just over one tenth of the art-museum directors expected to direct museums that were *not* art museums in the future. Almost two fifths of the theatre managing directors, but just one sixth of the art-museum directors anticipated working for arts service organizations. About one third of the CAA directors, theatre managing directors and orchestra managers expected to work in commercial media in the future. Over half of the theatre administrators reported it likely that they would become involved in the commercial stage, but fewer than one tenth of the art-museum directors expected to manage commercial art galleries.

Differences in Expectations of Men and Women

Women in all fields were somewhat less likely to anticipate moving to larger or more prestigious organizations than were their male counterparts. For example, 39 percent of male theatre managing directors but only 13 percent of female theatre administrators expected such a career move. Moreover, 52 percent of the women respondents who managed resident theatres compared to just 25 percent of the male theatre managers reported that they expected to take jobs outside of the performing arts. Women theatre managing directors were also substantially more likely than their male peers to anticipate working in public agencies concerned with the performing arts, arts service organizations, and the commercial media. These findings suggest that the resident stage may face the loss of many women participants through attrition.

By contrast women are no more likely than men to report plans to leave the other fields that we studied; in fact, the relatively few women respondents who directed art museums reported it "very unlikely" that they would ever work outside of museums or the visual arts more often (72 to 49 percent) than their male colleagues. Similarly, 69 percent of the male CAA directors but only 33 percent of the women directors anticipated moving to an arts-administrative position outside of the community arts.

Recall that the more recent cohorts of managers in all fields contained more women than did more senior cohorts. If expectations are good guides to behavior, these gains by women should hold up in orchestras, art museums, and local arts agencies; but they may be severely eroded by attrition of female managing directors in the resident stage.

Variation in Expectations by Cohort

Members of the most junior cohorts in all fields were most likely to expect to manage larger or more prestigious organizations in their fields. The middle cohorts were almost as optimistic among the orchestras and art museums but less so among the theatres and community arts agencies. The lower expectations of more experienced administrators in the latter fields may be a sign of disillusionment, but in some cases may represent a realistic reaction to two facts: first, the more senior managers have less time to make any moves and, second, because they are likely already to command larger and more prestigious institutions than their more junior peers, there may be little room for improvement.

Cohorts also varied in their propensity to leave arts administration. Art museum directors' commitment appeared to build with time: The longer directors had served in art museums, the less likely they were to contemplate working outside museums or the visual arts. By contrast, in the other fields commitment actually seemed to decline with experience. In both the orchestra and community arts fields, the most junior cohorts' members were least likely to anticipate leaving the field, while administrators in the cohort of middle seniority were most likely to anticipate taking a job unrelated to the arts. Among the orchestra managers, 36 percent of the most recent entrants but more than half of the middle cohorts reported it somewhat or very likely that they would leave arts administration. Among the CAA directors, comparable figures were 40 and 67 percent.

If arts management and museum administration, respectively, were becoming professions that span disciplines, we would expect that more recent recruits to theatre and CAA administration would be more likely than more senior managers to expect to take jobs in other fields of arts management; and that more recent entrants to the art-museum field would respond more often that they planned to direct museums other than art museums. The data provide meager support for this view. The newest recruits to theatre management were less likely than their more senior colleagues to anticipate managing other kinds of performing-arts organizations (and fewer than one third of any cohort reported such expectations). Over half of the CAA directors expected to move into other kinds of arts management, but no trend towards this view was discernable.[8] Among the art museum directors, not a single member of the most senior cohort expected to direct a non-art museums, while between 15 to 20 percent of the more recent cohorts did. Nonetheless, at this point, different kinds of museums and, to a lesser extent, different kinds of performing arts disciplines appear to constitute separate labor markets.

---

[8] Due to space limitations this question was omitted from the orchestra managers' survey.

Other Sources of Variation in Expectations: Budget Size and Career Experience

Although there was substantial variation among budget quartiles within each field in managers' expectations, much of it was relatively unpatterned. Directors of the smallest theatres and community arts agencies were more likely to anticipate working as artists than were administrators of larger organizations.

Where opportunities are blocked for men and women who attain top positions in their fields early in their careers, the disciplines may lose the services of its top executives. Indeed, almost half of the managers of the largest orchestras reported that they were likely to find jobs outside of the performing arts; and more than half of the directors of the two largest quartiles of CAAs (compared to 42 percent of the directors of smaller agencies) expected to leave arts work altogether. Managers of the largest quartiles of orchestras and CAAs were least apt of all respondents to report it likely that they would administer organizations similar to their own. By contrast, managing directors of the largest theatres were least likely to anticipate leaving their field.

Are administrators with management degrees more likely to look outside the arts to make their careers? Surprisingly, they are not. Almost half of the theatre managing directors with administration degrees, but only 16 percent of their colleagues, reported that it was "very unlikely" that they would take a job unrelated to the performing arts. In the other fields, individuals with and without management degrees were about equally likely to anticipate departure.

Theatre managing directors with prior experience as actors or "techies" appeared highly committed to the performing arts: just 23 percent compared to 45 percent of the administrators without such experience expected to leave the field. Similarly, orchestra managers with undergraduate or graduate degrees in music, or with experience in the arts (as artists or managers) before entering the orchestra field, were less likely than others to anticipate taking positions outside of the performing arts. Art museum directors with Ph.D.s were less likely than others to expect to administer museums that were not art museums; those who had been curators were less likely than others (24 percent compared to 39 percent) to report it somewhat or very likely that they would accept a position outside of museums or the visual arts.

In sum, these findings suggest that arts administrators with artistic backgrounds are somewhat more likely to have positive career expectations and less likely to anticipate leaving the arts than are those without such experiences. Nonetheless, there is no evidence that administrators with management degrees are any less committed to their fields than are administrators without them, despite the fact that their opportunities outside of the arts may be greater because of their training.

Multiple Regression Analyses of the Predictors of Expected Departure from Work in the Arts

In order to examine the *net* influence of the factors discussed thus far (and of additional aspects of background and attitudes) on administrators perceived likelihood of leaving the arts, we present the results of multiple regression analyses for each of the four fields (Table 9). These analyses permit us to examine the effects of various factors on the loss of managerial talent while controlling for the influence of other variables.

Age and seniority were largely unrelated to expecting to leave the performing arts. Career satisfaction, not surprisingly, had a substantial net effect on expected departures for every group but the orchestra managers. Satisfaction with contacts with artists bore a notable negative relationship to expected exit among art museum directors and a modest relationship for CAA directors. Controlling for other sources of satisfaction, art museum directors who enjoyed contact with their trustees were substantially more likely to anticipate leaving the museum and visual-arts worlds than those who did not.

The most powerful net negative predictor of expected departure for art museum directors was age. Those directors who worked in other fields before going into the arts and those directors who had been curators were notably more likely than others to plan to take jobs outside the arts. Among CAA directors, years of experience in the arts before CAA work bore a substantial and robust negative relationship to expected exit.

Among the resident-theatre managers, but not among the other administrators, women were substantially more likely, other things equal, than men to anticipate leaving the performing arts. (Recall that it was in the resident-theatre field that women were most disadvantaged relative to men in their earning power.) Controlling for other factors, theatre managers and orchestra managers with management degrees were less likely than others to expect to leave the performing arts. Orchestra managers with highly educated parents, music degrees, and high levels of educational attainment were somewhat more likely than others to expect to take jobs outside of the arts. Art-museum directors who attended private schools and held Ph.D.s in art history were notably less likely to plan to work outside museums or the visual arts than other directors.

Among the CAA directors, educational attainment modestly increased expected departure, while college quality negatively affected it. Holding these and other factors constant, directors with highly educated parents were less likely tha other to expect to leave the arts, while those whose fathers or principal guardians were professionals or owners or top executives of major businesses were more likely to anticipate departure.

Conclusions

To the extent that managers' reports of their own satisfactions and expectations are a guide to the extent to which fields are likely to retain administrative talent, none of these fields is in crisis but, to varying degrees, each will face challenges in the years ahead. Resident theatres may find it difficult to retain talented young men and, especially, women. Orchestras may find it difficult to provide satisfactions for young managers and to offer further career opportunities to successful managers of large institutions. The art museum field appears to face the fewest difficulties, but even here the most junior directors expressed less commitment than did members of more senior cohorts. Finally, local arts agencies are likely to encounter the most severe problems in attracting and retaining managerial talent: the most successful LAA directors may lack necessary opportunities for career growth; and members of the middle cohort appeared, from their responses, to be undergoing a crisis of confidence, reporting relatively low levels of satisfaction and high probabilities of leaving the arts.

Table 1: Salary by Field

	THEATRES	ORCHESTRAS	ART MUSEUMS	CAAs
$0-$10,000	12.74%	2.78	1.63	4.58
10,001-15,000	18.63	9.26	0.81	18.32
15,001-20,000	14.71	10.19	2.44	29.77
20,001-27,500	22.55	25.93	8.94	25.95
27,501-35,000	10.78	19.44	14.63	12.98
35,001-50,000	13.73	14.82	45.53	7.63
over $50,000	6.87	17.59	26.02	0.76
N	102	108	123	131

Table 2: Abbreviations and Explanations of Variables Used in Tables 30 - 35

Variable	Explanation
Background	
GEN	Gender (dichotomous variable: 1=female).
CLASS	Father or principal guardian's position on three-point scale: top group includes top managers or owners of large businesses and professionals; middle group includes middle managers, owners of small businesses, civil servants, educators, and engineers; bottom group includes blue-collar workers, farmers, and the unemployed.
PARED	Educational attainment of parent with highest educational level, 8-point scale.
Educational Experience	
EDUC	Educational attainment, 6-point scale.
PRIV	Attended private secondary school (dichotomous variable).
ASTIN	Astin scale of college quality (0 if no college attended).
UNIVX	Attended 'University X' (dichotomous variable, art museum directors only).
BIZ	Received undergraduate or graduate business degree (dichotomous variable, all but art museum directors).
ARTPH	Received Ph.D. in art history (dichotomous variable, art museum directors only).
MUS	Received undergraduate or graduate music degree (dichotomous variable, orchestra managers only).
Career Experience	
AGE	Age in years.
AGE2	Age at first top managerial position in field (all but CAA directors).
YRS1	Years experience in the arts (art museum and CAA directors).
YRS2	Years work experience in field (all but art museum directors).
YRS3	Years worked before entry into field.
YRS4	Years work in arts before entry into CAA field (CAA directors only).
YRS5	Years with current employer.
PRE	Worked in arts before entry into orchestra field (dichotomous variable, orchestra managers only).
CUR	Experience as curator (dichotomous variable, art museum directors only).
Other Rewards	
OPBUD	Operating budget of organization in dollars.
SAL	Salary in dollars (estimated at midpoints of categorical scale).
AUT	Satisfaction derived from autonomy and authority (5-point scale).
BRD	Satisfaction derived from contacts with board members (5-point scale).
ART	Satisfaction derived from contacts with artists (5-point scale).
CAR	Satisfaction derived from opportunities for career development (5-point scale).

Table 3: Multiple Regression Analyses of Predictors of Operating Budgets of Managers' Organizations for Four Fields*

I.V.	Theatres		Orchestras		Art Museums		CAAs	
	r	b	r	b	r	b	r	b
GEN	-.329	-.2468**	-.279	-.2004*	-.087		-.119	-.1741
CLASS	.024		.023		-.060		.025	
PARED	-.150		.041	.1612	-.016	-.1488	-.069	
EDUC	-.016	-.0148	.028		.021		-.174	-.1736*
PRIV	.136	.1580	.144	.1410	.202	.1708	.223	.1922**
ASTIN	-.094		.218	.1709*	.104		-.111	
UNIVX	NA		NA		.301	.2889**	NA	
AGE	.382		.120		.024		.098	
AGE2	.210		-.137		[-.021		NA	
YRS1	NA		NA		.123	.0903	.042	
YRS2	.445	.3885***	.397	.3833***	NA		.223	.1693*
YRS3	.062		.170		-.129		.178	.1860*
YRS5	.356		.180		.100		.034	
R^2	.2758		.2723		.1350		.1648	
p	.0001		.0001		.0021		.0001	

*I.V. stands for 'independent variables.' For definitions of these variables see Table 2 . r is the simple correlation between the independent and dependent variable. B is the standardized beta coefficient for the impact of the independent variable, controlling for the effects of the other independent variables. All variables entered into an equation appear in column B; r's for other variables are included for purposes of comparison. *=p less than or equal to .05; **=p less than or equal to .01; ***=p less than or equal to .001.

Table 4: Multiple Regression Analyses of Predictors of Managers' Salaries for Four Fields*

I.V.	Theatres		Orchestras		Art Museums		CAAs	
	r	b	r	b	r	b	r	b
GEN	-.396	-.1580*	-.427	-.1631*	-.332	-.2013	-.323	-.1619*
CLASS	.126		.023		-.122	-.1508	.203	.2080**
PARED	-.117		-.273	-.2137***	-.023		.023	
EDUC	-.004	.0076	.136		.308	.2405	.254	.2897***
PRIV	.193	.1380*	.020		.079		.140	
UNIVX	NA		NA		.344	.1989*	NA	
AGE	.528		.207		-.061		.121	
YRS1	NA		NA		.157	.1686*	.210	
YRS2	.576	.3089***	.519	.4031***	NA		.369	.2932**
YRS5	.398		.129	-.2952***	-.117		.225	.0662
OPBUD	.730	.5224***	.672	.5283***	.202	.1889*	.327	.2856***
R^2	.6486		.6540		.3111		.3846	
P	.0001		.0001		.0001		.0001	

*For explanation of symbols used in this table, please see Table 3 .

Table 5: Sources of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction, With Abbreviations

Salary	SAL
Autonomy and authority	AUT
Relations with subordinates	SUB
Relations with colleagues at other institutions	COL
Contacts with artists	ART
Contacts with board members	BRD
Contacts with private donors	DON
Contacts with government agencies	GOV
Role in community	ROL
Potential for career growth	CAR
Contact with works of art	WKS

Table 6: Mean Satisfaction, Rank, and Percentage Satisfied and Dissatisfied with Salary and Ten Intrinsic Job Factors by Field

FACTOR	MEASURE	THEATRES	ORCHESTRAS	ART MUSEUMS	CAAs
SAL	mean/rank	3.00(11)	3.46(10)	3.62(10)	3.20(10)
	% 4 or 5	31.37	50.93	56.20	37.12
	% 1 or 2	28.43	11.11	7.44	19.70
	N	102	108	121	132
AUT	mean/rank	4.14 (4)	4.14 (4)	4.29 (2)	4.27 (2)
	% 4 or 5	79.21	85.18	84.80	81.06
	% 1 or 2	8.91	5.56	6.40	6.06
	N	101	108	125	132
SUB	mean/rank	4.15 (2)	4.08 (6)	4.08 (5)	4.14 (4)
	% 4 or 5	84.00	72.64	78.22	81.53
	% 1 or 2	6.00	2.83	5.65	7.69
	N	100	106	124	130
COL	mean/rank	4.07 (5)	4.22 (2)	4.16 (3)	4.16 (3)
	% 4 or 5	75.25	80.37	82.93	79.54
	% 1 or 2	4.95	0.00	2.44	4.55
	N	101	107	123	132
ART	mean/rank	4.15 (3)	4.12 (5)	3.80 (9)	3.98 (5)
	% 4 or 5	77.23	77.78	59.66	69.47
	% 1 or 2	2.97	0.93	8.40	7.63
	N	101	108	119	131
BRD	mean/rank	3.68 (8)	3.85 (8)	3.81 (8)	3.82 (7)
	% 4 or 5	59.00	68.52	66.39	67.69
	% 1 or 2	14.00	7.41	9.24	10.77
	N	100	108	119	130
DON	mean/rank	3.09(10)	3.55 (9)	3.85 (7)	3.47 (9)
	% 4 or 5	32.00	49.53	64.23	46.09
	% 1 or 2	29.00	7.48	4.88	12.50
	N	100	107	123	128
GOV	mean/rank	3.16 (9)	3.11(11)	3.08(11)	3.20(10)
	% 4 or 5	36.63	34.26	28.10	40.15
	% 1 or 2	19.80	28.70	26.45	24.24
	N	101	108	121	132
ROL	mean/rank	3.88 (7)	4.17 (3)	4.09 (4)	4.38 (1)
	% 4 or 5	78.69	81.31	78.25	84.09
	% 1 or 2	7.07	2.80	2.42	4.55
	N	99	107	124	132
CAR	mean/rank	3.96 (6)	4.00 (7)	3.85 (6)	3.58 (8)
	% 4 or 5	68.63	74.04	66.67	57.58
	% 1 or 2	7.84	5.77	7.69	18.18
	N	102	104	117	132
WRK	mean/rank	4.29 (1)	4.38 (1)	4.46 (1)	3.92 (6)
	% 4 or 5	80.00	85.05	83.20	60.00
	% 1 or 2	4.00	0.00	7.20	7.69
	N	100	107	125	130

Table 7: Alternatives, Abbreviations, and Applicable Fields for Expectation Measures

Alternative	Abbrevs.	Theatres	Orchestras	Museums	CAA
Same similar position as now at similar organization	SAM	X	X	X	X
Same position as now at larger or more prestigious organization in same field	BIG	X	X	X	X
Artistic position[1]	ART	X	X	X	X
Director or staff of a public agency concerned with art form[2]	PUB	X	X	X	X
Director or staff of an arts-service organization	ASO	X		X	
Arts administration in another field[3]	OTH	X		X	X
Administrator or staff in a commercial media concern[4]	COM	X	X	X	X
Producer or administrator in commercial stage	BWY	X			
Director of a social service agency	SOC				X
Job unrelated to art form[5]	NOT	X	X	X	X

1. For theatres, 'artistic director of a resident theatre'; for orchestra, 'professional musician'; for museums, 'curator'; for CAAs, 'visual or performing artist.'

2. For theatres and orchestras, 'concerned with the performing art's; for museums, 'concerned with museums'; for CAAs, 'concerned with the arts (other than a CAA).'

3. For theatres, 'orchestra, opera, or dance company'; for museums, 'a museum that is not an art museum'; for CAAs, 'a performing arts organization or a museum.'

4. For art museums, 'director of a commercial gallery'; for other fields, as it reads.

5. For theatres and orchestras, 'unrelated to the performing arts'; for museums, 'unrelated to museums or the visual arts'; for CAAs, 'unrelated to the arts.'

Table 8: Mean Responses, Percent Indicating 'Very' or 'Somewhat Likely', and N for Each Expectation by Field

Factor	Measure	Theatres	Orchestras	Art Museums	CAAs
SAM	Mean	2.64	2.49	2.68	2.53
	% Likely	58.00	52.78	62.09	55.38
	N	100	108	124	130
BIG	Mean	2.81	2.84	2.85	2.73
	% Likely	67.00	67.59	65.04	61.82
	N	100	108	123	131
ART*	Mean	2.27	1.25	1.75	1.45
	% Likely	29.41	6.60	22.76	13.85
	N	102	106	123	130
PUB*	Mean	2.23	2.02	1.79	2.73
	% Likely	40.20	31.48	22.76	68.18
	N	102	108	123	132
ASO	Mean	2.21		1.54	
	% Likely	39.22		16.13	
	N	102		124	
OTH*	Mean	1.94		1.48	2.44
	% Likely	22.55		12.10	50.00
	N	102		124	132
COM*	Mean	2.19	1.90	1.41	2.06
	% Likely	32.00	29.91	9.68	33.59
	N	100	107	124	131
BWY	Mean	2.57			
	% Likely	52.94			
	N	102			
SOC	Mean				1.61
	% Likely				16.79
	N				131
NOT*	Mean	2.23	1.97	1.86	2.47
	% Likely	33.33	35.18	29.27	50.38
	N	102	108	123	131

Table 9 : Multiple Regression Analyses of Predictors of Managers' Assessments of the Likelihood that they will Take Positions Outside of the Arts*

	Theatres		Orchestras		Art Museums		CAAs	
I.V.	r	b	r	b	r	b	r	b
GEN	.227	.2480**	-.078	-.0100	-.101		.016	
CLASS	-.005		.198		-.031		.000	-.2065*
PARED	.014		.237	.2382	-.111		.158	-.2743**
EDUC	.097	.1601	.155	.1575	.143		.094	.1427
PRIV	-.116		.080		.135	-.1789*	.100	
ASTIN	.061		-.009		.094		-.009	-.1736
MUS	NA		.128	.1489	NA		NA	
BIZ	-.148	-.1588	-.255	-.2402**	NA		.102	
ARTPH	NA		NA		.058	-.1384	NA	
AGE	.072	.1128	-.233	-.1679	-.300	-.4249***	-.167	
YRS2	-.010		-.168		NA		.001	
YRS3	.034		-.007		.018	.2266*	.083	
YRS4	NA		NA		NA		-.232	-.2528**
YRS5	.019		-.068		-.242		.007	.0734
CUR	NA		NA		.183	.2563**	NA	
OPBUD	-.084		-.011		-.090		.014	
SAL	-.045		-.064		-.002		.095	.0683
BRD	.120		.025		.005	.2393**	-.135	
ART	-.184		-.127		-.198	-.1806*	-.256	-.1553
CAR	-.240	-.2830	-.087	-.0627	-.283	-.3158***	-.327	-.3018
R^2	.1713		.2134		.3214		.2588	
P	.0029		.0014		.0001		.0001	

*For explanation of terms used in this table, please see Table 3 .

CHAPTER 4: THE TRAINING OF ARTS ADMINISTRATORS

The need for skilled managers has been a topic of much discussion in the arts during the past decade, as the number of arts organizations has increased and the complexity of these organizations has risen. Many universities have founded arts management programs that train and certify administrators.[1] Service organizations and public agencies have sponsored internships. Technical assistance programs, carried out by consulting firms and active arts administrators have been supported by public agencies and service organizations, as well. Almost all of the major service organizations conduct workshops and seminars for in-service managers. Advocates of different approaches to management training have developed fervently argued and often persuasive rationales in behalf of their favorite approaches.

This discussion and activity has proceeded in a knowledge vacuum. Systematic information about the way in which arts administrators learn their jobs, their evaluations of different training techniques, and their perceived needs - except for local-level needs-assessments and evaluations of specific programs - has been unavailable.

This chapter provides a data base for assessing the needs of arts administrators and documenting the manner in which they have addressed these needs. In the pages that follow, we shall consider, first, the extent to which managers believed that they were well or poorly prepared for several management functions at the time they assumed their first top administrative position; second, the extent to which they used several available training formats for learning about these functions; third, their global evaluations of seven kinds of arts management training; and, finally, assessments of several training formats by administrators who reported experience with them. This chapter represents the first national study of the learning experiences and opinions of working arts administrators that permits comparison among artistic disciplines and that distinguishes explicitly among several management functions in considering the value of different training approaches.

---

[1] Center for Arts Administration, University of Wisconsin. *Survey of Arts Administration Training 1985-86*. 1984. New York: American Council for the Arts.

The reader is cautioned not to interpret any of the findings presented here as reflecting definitively on the objective quality of any method of training. First, all of these findings are based on subjective opinions of arts administrators. We cannot tell which approaches to training best enhance the effectiveness of administrators, because we have no way of knowing how effective these respondents are. Second, different organizations require that their administrators have different skills: Financial management ability may be more crucial, for example, to an art-museum director whose museum does not have a full-time assistant director for financial affairs than for one whose museum offers this kind of support. Third, the assessments of different learning methods cannot be generalized to all sources of a given kind of training. There are good and bad consultants, good and bad administration courses, and good and bad internships. This report of administrators' reactions to the ones they have experienced should not be used as a shoppers' guide. Finally, this study's survey methodology does not lend itself to an investigation of the ways in which administrators acquire, or fail to acquire, a critical aspect of arts-administrative competence: sensitivity to the needs of artists and the requirements of artistic work, and commitment to the core artistic missions of their organizations. Notwithstanding these caveats, this chapter does provide information that will be of interest to managers, policy makers, and educators concerned with the preparation of arts administrators

Level of Preparation

Respondents were requested to evaluate their own level of preparation in each of seven management functions at the time they assumed their first top administrative position, using a three-point scale (1="good," 2="fair," and 3="poor"). Four of the functions about which administrators were asked (financial management, personnel management, board relations, and labor relations) are primarily internal. Three functions (planning and development, marketing and public relations, and, for art museum and CAA directors, government relations) concern the management of the organization's external environment.

Table 1 displays the percentages by discipline of respondents reporting that their preparation for each function was either "good" or "poor." Strikingly few managers felt that they were well prepared to assume many of these management functions. For example, fewer than one third of the administrators in any discipline believed that their preparation in financial management was "good," while between one and two fifths of the respondents in each field reported poor preparation. Indeed, only among the CAA directors, and only for planning and development, and marketing and public relations, did slightly more than half of the respondents report that they were well prepared for any management function. In most cases, a plurality of respondents characterized their preparation as "fair." Only in the field of labor relations (which may have been less important for the administrators of smaller organizations, especially museums and community arts agencies), did more than two fifths of the administrators in each field regard their preparation as "poor."

More than one third of the theatre managing directors considered their preparation "good" in personnel management, planning and development, and marketing and public relations. Almost half reported that they were poorly prepared for labor relations, compared to one fifth who considered their background in this area good. Almost as many managing directors considered themselves poorly prepared as well prepared for financial management and board relations. In the latter area, the managing directors reported levels of preparation inferior to those of administrators in other art forms.

Art museum directors, by contrast, reported their best preparation as being for board relations. In no other area did even one third of the respondents report that their preparation was "good." Far more directors reported "poor" preparation for labor relations, government relations and financial planning than reported being well prepared; and about one third each indicated that they were well and poorly prepared, respectively, in marketing and public relations.

Orchestra managers reported relatively strong preparation for board relations and for marketing and public relations, although even in these areas more than one in five indicated that he or she had been poorly prepared. More than one third reported being well prepared for personnel management and for planning and development. Almost half described their readiness for labor relations as poor; and about one quarter each reproted being poorly prepared or well prepared for financial management.

More than half of the CAA directors (the field in which managers were most likely to report prior nonprofit management experience) indicated good preparation in planning and development and in marketing and public relations, and approximately two fifths reported good preparation for personnel management, board relations, and government relations. Only in the areas of financial management and labor relations (where almost five times as many respondents characterized their preparation as poor than as good) did fewer than one third of the CAA directors reported that they were well prepared.

In summary, then, these data suggest that none of the artistic fields considered here prepared prospective administrators satisfactorily for their first executive jobs. A substantial minority in each field characterized their preparation for one or more important administrative responsibility as inadequate, and only a minority in any field reported that they were well prepared for their jobs in many areas of responsibility. In particular, preparation for financial management and labor relations in each of these fields appears to have been problematic. In addition, readiness for board relations among theatre managing directors, and for marketing and public relations, and government relations among art-museum directors were reported to be particularly low.

It is possible, of course, that some fields had already begun to address the problems by the time these surveys were conducted. If this were the case, we would expect administrators in the most recent cohorts to report higher levels of preparation than the members of more senior cohorts. Although recollections are not always trustworthy - it would be better if someone had undertaken a comparable survey fifteen years before - they can at least provide some guide to changes over time.[2]

The only discipline in which administrators reported becoming better prepared for the management functions described here during the professional lifetimes of current managers is the resident stage. For all functions but labor relations, the most recent entrants were more likely to report having been well prepared than were members of either of the two more senior cohorts. And for all functions but personnel management, they were less likely to term their preparation "poor" than were members of either of the preceding cohorts. In personnel management and in planning and development, each cohort contained a larger proportion of respondents who considered themselves well prepared than did the one preceding them. For financial management, planning and development, and marketing and public relations, each successive cohort contains a smaller proportion of individuals who reported that they were poorly prepared. The most junior managing directors were only half as likely to consider themselves well prepared for labor relations than were the most senior managing directors; and board relations appeared to present a special difficulty for the middle cohort of managing directors.

By contrast, the percentage of art museum directors reporting poor preparation was higher for every function but personnel management among the most junior cohort than among the cohort that preceded them (although lower in every case than the percentage for the most senior directors). Taken at face value, these data suggest that preparation of museum directors improved markedly between the first and second cohorts, but deteriorated somewhat among the most recent entrants. When one recalls that the professionalization occurring among art-museum directors in recent years had much more to do with art-historical credentials than with administrative ones, this pattern is not surprising.

---

[2] Recall that cohorts were constructed so that each contains approximately one third of the respondents in each field; and that, consequently, cohorts in different fields represent quite different spans of years. See Chapter 2, Table 4 for the periods covered by cohorts in each field.

If theatre managing directors felt better prepared for their first administrative post, the perceived readiness of orchestra managers for their first executive positions actually seems to have declined with time.[3] For every function but planning and development, the most recent entrants into the orchestra field reported lower levels of preparation than either of the cohorts before them. By contrast, however, except for personnel management and labor relations, fewer members of the most recent cohort reported being poorly prepared than members of the preceding cohorts.

Because most CAA directors were relatively new to their field, there was less reason to expect inter-cohort change in that field than in others. Members of the middle cohort reported better preparation in virtually every respect than did the more senior directors, many of whom were pioneers in agency management. The most junior cohort reported better preparation than their predecessors in financial management and in planning and development (for which almost two thirds indicate "good" preparation), were similar with respect to personnel management and board relations, and somewhat less likely to report being well prepared in the areas of marketing and public relations, labor relations, and government relations than were members of the middle cohort.

---

[3] It is possible that this difference could result from the fact that orchestra administration has become more complex; but the same is true of art-museum administration, where the apparent deterioration was not evident.

On the basis of these self-reports, it seems that theatre managing directors have become better prepared for their first top administrative posts during the careers of the respondents to these surveys; art museum directors and community arts agency directors became better prepared between the times that the most senior and middle cohorts assumed top managerial posts, but readiness remained stable or declined thereafter; and the subjective readiness of orchestra managers for their first top positions seems to have declined.

Neither budget size nor career experience were systematically associated with managerial preparation in any of the four fields. Administrators with higher degrees in artistic majors reported lower levels of preparation for at least some functions in each of the fields, but the differences were, in most cases, small. The absence of association between budget size and reported preparation in all fields but theatre (where there was a negative association) was striking, for it suggests that lack of prior management training or experience has not been a serious impediment to administrative career success. This fact suggests that arts administrators might, on the whole, place greater stock in on-the-job experience than in formal training, since it is the former that has generally been responsible for their own achievements. In the sections that follow, this is precisely what we shall find.

How Managers Learned

We did not ask administrators to assess their own current competence, for responses to such a question would have been influenced at least as much by personality and expectations as by actual levels of skill. Nonetheless, it seems reasonable to assume that almost all of the respondents have, during the course of their careers, learned something about each of the functional areas. Each respondent was asked, for each area of managerial responsibility, to indicate if he or she had made use of each of five learning formats to learn that function; and, if she or he had, to assess the value of his or her experience. (The learning formats were "on-the-job" training, professional workshops and seminars, university arts-administration courses, university general-management courses, and consultants.) In this section, we shall consider the extent to which top administrators in each of the four fields had used each of the training formats to learn each of the management functions.[4]

Most of the administrators in all fields reported learning most of the management functions at least in part while on the job. (See Table 2.) (The only exception to this generalization - labor relations in CAAs - is a function that is not salient to many administrators in this group.) Next in importance was the professional workshop or seminar, particularly in the community arts and orchestra fields, and only slightly less so among theatre managing directors. Managers in all fields, but especially art museums and theatres, reported using consultants for a variety of purposes. And minorities of administrators in each field reported using university arts-administration and general-management courses to learn about several management functions.

---

[4] For each function, respondents were asked to indicate in one column which of the five learning formats they had used; and to provide, in columns located to the right of this column, their assessments of their experiences for only those training methods they had used themselves. In fact, most respondents failed to use the first column to indicate explicitly the methods they had used. Most of them simply circled assessments to the right of some of the learning formats. In coding these responses, we assumed that, where only some of the assessments were circled, that these learning formats had been used and that those formats for which no assessments were offered had not been employed. Where all assessments were circled for all functions, we inferred that the respondent had misunderstood the instructions, and treated the responses as missing data. In the few cases in which a respondent circled some of the numbers next to training methods in the first column, but provided assessments for each of the training methods in the columns to the right, only those assessments of formats for which use was indicated in the first column were coded. In calculating the percentage of respondents who had made use of a given learning format, the N used was the largest number of respondents to any question in the first part of this section of the survey, which requested information regarding level of preparation for each function.

Financial Management

Next to on-the-job experience, workshops were the most common source of information about financial management in all fields but theatre, where consultants held a slight edge. Between 37 percent (art-museum directors) and 52 percent (orchestra managers) of respondents in each field reported attending professional workshops or seminars on these topics. Between 28 percent (CAA directors) and 57 percent (theatre administrators) reported using consultants for support in this area. Between 22 percent (art-museum directors) and 33 percent (orchestra managers) took university general-management courses concerned with financial management, while between 17 percent (art-museum directors) and 24 percent (theatre managers) took arts-administration courses in this area.

Personnel Management

Again, on-the-job experience predominated in this area, with workshops in second place in each field but the resident stage, where consultants were more common. Between 28 percent (theatre managing directors) and 40 percent (orchestra managers) of respondents reported attending workshops or seminars on personnel management, while between 16 percent (CAA directors) and 36 percent (theatre administrators) reported using consultants. Between 16 percent (CAA directors) and 23 percent (theatre managing directors) reported taking university general-management courses on this topic, while from 9 percent (CAA directors) to 18 percent (orchestra managers) indicated that they had learned about personnel management in arts-administration courses.

Board Relations

After on-the-job experience, workshops were the leading source of training about board relations in each field, involving from 24 percent of the art-museum directors to 46 percent of the theatre managing directors. Use of consultants on this topic varied markedly among fields, from none of the art-museum directors, about one fifth and one quarter of the CAA and orchestra managers, respectively, and 44 percent of the theatre administrators using consultants for this purpose. Board relations was the only function for which respondents in every field reported using arts-administration courses more than general-management courses, although relatively few respondents had learned about board relations in either.

Planning and Development

More respondents participated in workshops and seminars on planning and development than used any other kind of formal training format, except among the art-museum directors, who were somewhat more likely to engage consultants for this purpose. From 34 percent (art-museum directors) to just over half (theatre administrators) reported attending workshops on planning and development, while from 39 percent (orchestra managers) to 47 percent (theatre managing directors) reported retaining consultants. Minorities in each field learned about planning and development in arts-administration courses (from 16 percent of CAA directors to 20 percent of orchestra managers) or in university general-management courses (from 17 percent of art-museum directors to 23 percent of orchestra managers).

Marketing and Public Relations

Again, workshops and seminars led the formal training mechanisms in every field except art museums, where consultants predominated. Just over half the managers reported learning about marketing and public relations in professional workshops or seminars in every field but the art museums (29 percent). Consultant were used by about one third of the respondents in every field but theatre, where just 5 percent reported using them for this purpose. Between 12 percent (CAA directors) and 20 percent (orchestra managers) reported learning about this topic in university arts-administration courses, while from 15 percent of the art-museum directors to 25 percent of the orchestra managers did so in general-management courses.

Labor Relations

Fewer respondents reported on-the-job learning in this area than in any other, although such experience was reported more commonly than any other kind of learning. Over one third of the orchestra managers attended labor-relations workshops, compared to one seventh to one fifth of respondents in other fields. Approximately one third of the theatre managing directors, art-museum directors, and orchestra managers had retained consultants on this topic, compared to just over 10 percent of the CAA directors. Fewer than one in ten CAA directors reported learning about labor relations in either arts-administration or general-management courses. Between 10 and 20 percent of administrators in other fields had either arts-administration or general-management courses that treated labor relations.

Government Relations

Only the art-museum directors and CAA directors were asked about government relations and, for both groups, on-the-job experience was by far the most common way of learning. About a quarter of the directors in each group had attended workshops on the subject; and a quarter of the art-museum directors and just under one fifth of the CAA directors had used consultants. Only about 10 percent in each group reported learning about government relations in either arts-administration or general-management courses.

Summary

On-the-job training was far more important than any other kind in familiarizing arts administrators with the functions that they performed. Consultants and professional workshops and seminars were also used by substantial minorities to educate themselves about aspects of their jobs. University arts-administration and general-management courses trained a smaller minority of the administrators in each field, particularly in the area of financial management. While reported use of these training formats was remarkably similar from field to field, theatre managing directors and art-museum directors were particularly likely to report the use of consultants in many areas. Art-museum directors reported making less use of professional workshops and seminars than managers in other disciplines. Theatre managing directors reported relatively high rates of attendance at university arts-administration courses; orchestra managers relied to a greater extent than others on university general-management courses; and CAA directors reported taking somewhat fewer courses than administrators in other fields.

In all the fields but the art museums, and especially among the resident-theatre managers, use of university arts-administration and general-management courses for learning a variety of managerial functions increased markedly among the more junior cohorts. The increase occurred alongside of an increase in workshop attendance, as well. University programs did not train a majority of recent entrants in any field; and actual degrees from arts-administration or general-management programs were still relatively rare. But such programs were more likely to be used by recent entrants in every field but art museums and, in at least one field, for every purpose. If the trend were to continue, it would represent a significant change in the way that arts administrators learn their jobs.

Administrators' Global Assessments of Selected Training Methods

Respondents were asked to indicate their "general assessment of the relative value" of several forms of "management training" for administrators in their own field by ranking each on a scale drom "1" to "10." The forms of training evaluated were university arts-administration training (prior to first top administrative post); university general-management training (prior to first top administrative position); internships; in-service training in university arts-management courses; in-service training in university general-management courses; professional workshops or seminars; consultancies by full-time management consultants; consultancies by other top administrators in the respondent's field; and "learning by doing on the job."[5] In addition, a space was left blank for respondents to add alternative approaches. Ranks were converted to a three-category scale, for which "1" indicats a rank of from 1 to 3, "2" indicates a rank of from 4 to 6, and "3" indicates a rank of from 7 to 10.

---

[5] In the instrument sent to theatre managing directors, the fourth alternative was "in-service training in university theatre-management courses" rather than "arts-management" courses, as in the other surveys.

The purpose of this question was not to assess the actual value of the approaches to management training about which the respondents were asked, since responses were sought from individuals who had not experienced each approach first-hand, and since meaningful evaluations require some specificity as to the goal of the training. (For example, a given format may be superb for learning financial management, but poor for learning about how to use a board of trustees.) Rather the purpose of this question was to tap the general reputation of each form of training among administrators in each field. The findings reported below tell us more about the culture of each field than about the actual value of the training approaches described. We shall see in the next section that reports of administrators who have used each training method diverge in important ways from the reputations of these approaches among administrators as a group.

The percentage of administrators in each field ranking each learning format in the top and bottom of the three collapsed categories is reported in Table 3. There was a surprisingly high degree of consistency in the rankings from discipline to discipline.[6] On-the-job experienced was ranked in the top three by more respondents than any form of training in all four fields; and ranked in the bottom four by fewer respondents than any other training format in all fields but orchestras, the managers of which gave even fewer low ratings to internships. Apparently, these are fields in which lack of formal training has been no obstacle to success. Internships (another form of on-the-job training) were ranked in the top three by the next largest proportion of respondents in every field as well.

---

[6] For reasons that are not apparent, theatre managing directors, but not other respondents, exhibited a high degree of selective nonresponse to these questions. Consequently, data for the theatre administrators must be interpreted with caution.

Arts-administration training prior to assuming the first top managership was ranked high by the next greatest percentage of theatre managing directors and art-museum directors, while workshops and seminars came in third among the orchestra managers and CAA directors. Orchestra managers rated arts-administration training before assuming first top position fourth; CAA and art-museum directors rated in-service arts-administration training fourth, while theatre managing directors chose consultancies by peers.

By contrast, respondents in all fields were unanimous in ranking consultancies by management consultants in the bottom categories more frequently than any other form of training. University general-management training - both prior to taking on a top post and in-service - was ranked low by relatively large percentages in each field, as well.

Most striking about these findings was the relative consensus among managers in these fields about the general value of these approaches. On-the-job training and internships were valued very highly as, to a lesser extent, were workshops. Peer consultants and arts-administration courses had both proponents and detractors. General-management training met with much skepticism and consultancies by management consultants were accorded little stature as a management-training tool.

There were few differences by cohort among the art-museum directors, orchestra managers, or CAA directors. But among theatre managing directors, there appeared to be some trend towards more positive evaluations of arts-administration training programs and, in particular, pre-service, general-management training. While the most senior cohort of theatre administrators ranked pre-service general-management training below even management consultants, 40 percent of the most junior cohort ranked such training in the top three. By contrast, there appears to have been a concommitant decline in the reputation of workshops as a means of training, with more than a third of the most recent entrants to the field, compared to just 14 percent of the more senior managing directors, rating workshops and seminar in the bottom categories. Moreover the most recent entrants also held a relatively lower estimation of peer consultancies than did members of the most senior cohort. Consistent with the increased use of academic administration training among theatre managing directors is an improved reputation for such training programs and a devaluation of peer instruction through workshops and consultancies.

Evaluation of Learning Methods by Managers Who Had Used Them

The last section reported global evaluations of training formats by managers who had and had not used them. This section reports on the utility of specific training formats for learning about specific selected management functions, as evaluated by administrators who had themselves employed them for these purposes.

Even with this added specificity, the evaluations reported here must be interpreted with caution. First of all, the characterizations of training methods are broad and include many diverse programs. If one set of administrators reports finding, e.g., a consultant more useful in learning about labor relations than does another set of managers, it may be that the more positive respondents used superior consultants. Second, many of these findings are based on assessments by very small sets of experienced managers.

Respondents were asked, for each of seven management functions, to rate any of five training formats that they had actually employed as "very useful," "somewhat useful," or "not useful." The training formats were "on-the-job" training; workshops and seminars; consultants; university arts-administration courses; and university general-management courses.

Financial Management

On-the-job experience was evaluated as most useful for financial-management training by administrators in all disciplines.[7] Among respondents in all but the community arts agencies, consultants were ranked second for this purpose, followed closely by workshops and, at some distance, university arts-management and general-management programs. Art museum directors were more likely to consider university arts-management financial training "not useful" (38 percent of those who had tried it) than "very useful" (24 percent), while theatre managing directors were evenly split. By contrast, CAA directors rated both university general-management and arts-management courses very highly, above any other source of training but on-the-job epxerience, as preparation for financial-management responsibilities. CAA directors also rated consultants positively, with more than half of those who had used them calling the experience "very useful."

Personnel Management

Respondents in all fields also considered on-the-job experience the best form of preparation for personnel management. Theatre managing directors rated consultants and university general-management courses next in value (although one fifth of them considered the latter "not useful"). Art museum directors rated workshops and consultants positively, with more than two fifths of those who had used each indicating that they were "very useful." Orchestra managers were also particularly favorable towards workshops and consultants for personnel-management training (although one fifth evaluated the latter negatively). The percentage of users responding that arts-administration courses were not useful for learning personnel management exceeded the percentage calling them "very useful" among all but CAA directors, and especially among art-museum directors. CAA directors, by contrast, rated arts-administration courses (and, to a lesser extent, all other forms of training) very positively for this function.

---

[7] All findings in this section reflect only the responses of administrators who had actually employed the training format for the purpose at hand.

Board Relations

Once again, on-the-job training was most positively evaluated for board relations. Consultants received particularly high ratings as sources of training in this area in all fields but art museums (where they were not used for this purpose). Workshops were also regarded very favorably by all but the art-museum directors, a sizable minority of whom rated them as "not useful." University arts-administration courses were deemed "not useful" by far more respondents than thought them "very useful" among all groups except the CAA directors, who rated them very highly as a source of information about board relations. University general-management courses were considered "not useful" by majorities in every field but the community arts, and rated "very useful" by none of the respondents.

Planning and Development

Respondents again rated on-the-job training most useful as preparation for planning-and-development responsibilities. Consultants were also highly valued for this function: More than half of those who had used them in every field considered consultancies "very useful." Workshops were also rated "very useful" by majorities of every group but art-museum directors. Theatre and orchestra administrators rated general-management courses more highly than arts-administration courses; while art-museum directors preferred arts-administration courses and CAA directors rated both highly.

Marketing and Public Relations

For marketing and public relations preparation, on-the-job experience was again rated as "very useful" by the largest percentage of respondents in each field and rated "not useful" by the smallest percentage. Workshops were rated highly by almost two thirds of those who had used them in every field but art museums, whose directors were more likely to report that they were "somewhat useful" for learning about marketing and public relations. CAA directors expressed great enthusiasm for every training approach they had employed, particularly arts-administration courses, which four out of five found "very useful." Performing-arts administrators also regarded arts-administration courses favorably for this purpose (over two fifths found them "very useful"), while half of the art-museum directors rated such courses "not useful," and fewer than one fifth were very positive. Orchestra managers gave general-management courses high marks for this purpose, theatre administrators tended to rate them as "somewhat useful," and slightly more art-museum directors reported that they had been "not useful" than called them "very useful" for learning about marketing and public relations.

Labor Relations

Fewer administrators reported that on-the-job experience was very useful for learning about labor relations than about any other function, although all but art-museum directors (who rated consultants higher) were more likely to call such experience "very useful" than any other training technique. More than half of every group but the CAA directors considered their experiences with labor-relations consultants "very useful," and few gave them low marks. By contrast, more than 30 percent of every set of managers but the CAA directors considered both arts-administration and general-management courses "not useful," although a plurality of theatre administrators considered the latter "very useful." Workshops were highly valued by orchestra managers, and considered "very useful" by more respondents than considered them "not useful" in every field.

Government Relations

Only art-museum and CAA directors were asked to evaluate training approaches to government relations. Each preferred on-the-job experience to any other form of learning, and both (but especially the CAA directors) were very positively inclined towards consultants and workshops. More than half of the art-museum directors considered arts-administration training "not useful" for learning government relations, and none of them reported that it was "very useful." By contrast, CAA directors were more positive in their evaluations of arts-administration courses for this purpose.

Conclusions

In general, then, administrators ranked on-the-job training particularly highly as preparation for financial management, personnel management, and board relations, and relatively low as background for labor relations. Workshops were reported to be relatively useful ways of learning about financial management, planning and development, and marketing and public relations, but less useful for learning about board relations and labor relations. Consultants were seen as very useful for training in planning and development and in marketing and public relations; and less useful for learning about labor relations and, especially, personnel management. Arts-administration and general-management courses were both given comparatively high marks on marketing and public relations and considered not very useful for training in labor relations or board relations. Many administrators found arts-administration courses helpful in learning about planning and development; and general-management courses useful for learning financial management. In general, respondents had few positive evaluations about most methods of learning about labor relations and board relations; and reported positive evaluations of a range of sources of information about marketing and public relations, financial management, and planning and development.

Administrators from different fields varied in their assessments of different learning methods. Art-museum directors tended, on the whole, to be less likely to rate experiences as very useful than members of other groups, while CAA directors were somewhat more likely, other things equal, to express positive sentiments. Orchestra managers were particularly positive, as a group, in their evaluation of workshops, while CAA directors were unusually positive in their assessment of general-management and, particularly, arts-administration programs.

These specific evaluations by administrators who had experience with different forms of training differed from the global evaluations by all administrators in two notable respects. Although the global reputation of consultants among all administrators is quite low, those managers who actually used consultants for various purposes reported high levels of satisfaction. By contrast, despite the fact that arts-administration programs were rated relatively highly by the administrators on the whole, those respondents who reported using arts-administration courses found them relatively unhelpful for most purposes. (Paradoxically, the one exception to this, the CAA directors, are members of the population that, as a whole, gave arts-administration courses the lowest global evaluations.) These findings suggest that generalized reputations of training programs may be poor guides to decisions, either by policy makers planning programs or by aspiring administrators seeking instruction.[8]

---

[8] Intra-field differences by cohort, budget size, and experience are not reported here because dividing the administrators with experience in each area into these subgroups generates subgroups too small to be interpreted meaningfully.

Table 1: Managers' Evaluation of Their Own Levels of Preparation in Each of Seven Management Functions at the Time They Assumed Their First Top Managerships in Their Fields (1="good" preparation; 3="poor" preparation)*

		FM	PM	BR	PD	MP	LR	GR
Theatres	1	27.45	42.57	30.69	37.62	39.60	20.00	NA
	3	25.49	13.86	29.70	23.76	16.83	45.26	
	N	102	101	101	101	101	95	
Art Museums	1	25.60	30.40	45.83	32.52	29.27	15.25	21.95
	3	40.80	24.00	14.17	23.58	30.89	55.00	43.09
	N	125	125	120	123	123	118	123
Orchestras	1	26.42	36.89	43.14	33.33	47.06	22.00	NA
	3	23.58	15.53	23.53	19.61	20.59	49.00	
	N	106	103	102	102	102	100	
CAAs	1	29.46	39.84	42.64	52.71	53.13	11.02	37.01
	3	20.16	13.28	17.83	14.73	11.72	50.85	25.20
	N	129	128	129	129	128	118	127

*FM=Fiscal management; PM=Personnel management; BR=Board relations; PD=Planning and development; MP=marketing and public relations; LR=Labor relations; GR=Government relations.

Table 2 : Percentage of Top Administrators in Four Fields Reporting Use of Five Learning Methods by Function*

Discipline		FM*	PM	BR	PD	MP	LR	GR
Theatres	OJ*	96.08%	97.06	99.02	96.08	95.10	91.18	NA
	WS	49.02	28.43	46.08	53.92	55.88	17.65	
N=102	AA	23.53	15.69	14.71	17.65	18.63	14.71	
	GM	28.43	22.55	12.75	17.65	17.65	11.76	
	CN	56.86	36.27	44.12	47.06	4.90	33.33	
Art Museums	OJ	92.80	92.80	90.40	92.80	92.80	83.20	91.20
	WS	36.80	39.20	24.00	34.40	28.80	21.60	27.20
N=125	AA	16.80	15.20	15.20	18.40	12.80	14.40	12.80
	GM	22.40	21.60	12.80	16.80	15.20	17.60	12.80
	CN	36.80	32.80	0.00	39.20	38.40	32.00	24.80
Orchestras	OJ	99.06	99.06	95.28	96.23	95.28	89.62	NA
	WS	51.89	39.62	44.34	49.06	55.67	34.91	
N=106	AA	22.64	17.92	16.04	19.81	19.81	18.87	
	GM	33.02	17.92	14.15	22.64	24.53	19.81	
	CN	36.79	23.58	26.42	38.68	36.79	33.02	
CAAs	OJ	89.15	92.25	93.02	89.15	88.37	65.12	86.82
	WS	45.74	31.78	44.96	58.91	57.36	14.73	24.03
N-129	AA	18.60	9.30	10.85	15.50	12.40	6.20	10.85
	GM	25.58	16.28	7.75	21.71	18.60	8.53	8.53
	CN	27.91	16.28	22.48	42.64	31.01	10.85	17.05

*KEY TO FUNCTIONS (horizontal): FM=fiscal management; PM=personnel management; BR=board relations; PD=planning and development; MP=marketing and public relations; LR=labor relations; GR=government relations

KEY TO LEARNING METHODS (vertical): OJ=on the job; WS=professional workshops and seminars; AA=university arts-administration courses; GM=university general-management courses; CN=consultants.

Table 3: Percentage of Top Administrators in Four Fields Ranking Value of Each of Nine Learning Methods 1 through 3 (1) or 7-10 (3) in List of Ten

Discipline		A1*	G1	IN	A2	G2	WS	MC	PC	OJ
Theatres	1	41.11%	25.33	54.43	34.48	12.20	33.67	20.43	41.11	79.31
	3	28.89	30.67	12.92	22.41	36.59	21.43	47.31	25.56	9.20
	N	90	75	79	58	41	98	93	90	87
Art Museums	1	41.05	29.91	58.68	40.00	27.83	38.14	19.13	32.48	80.65
	3	29.06	31.62	16.53	20.00	33.04	27.12	46.96	33.33	8.06
	N	117	117	121	110	115	118	115	117	124
Orchestras	1	35.58	27.18	60.78	31.07	21.57	40.78	14.85	26.47	78.64
	3	30.77	37.86	8.82	22.33	41.18	18.45	61.39	43.14	10.68
	N	104	103	102	103	102	103	101	102	103
CAAs	1	28.80	26.40	46.77	39.84	23.20	45.31	15.87	37.01	65.89
	3	39.20	37.60	22.58	19.51	34.40	20.31	50.00	31.50	12.40
	N	125	125	124	123	125	128	126	127	129

*KEY: A1=university arts-administration training before becoming top administrator; G1=university general-management training before becoming top administrator; IN=internships; A2=university arts-administration training in-service; G2=in-service university general-management training; WS=professional workshops and seminars; MC=full-time management consultants; PC=peer consultations; OJ=learning by doing on the job. For theatres, A2=in-service university theatre-management training.

CHAPTER 5: PROFESSIONAL PARTICIPATION AND ATTITUDES TOWARDS PROFESSIONALISM

In this chapter, we examine evidence regarding the extent and nature of "professionalism" among the arts administrators who responded to our surveys. The definition of "professionalism" adopted here refers to a set of attitudes and behaviors associated with a distinctive form of occupational organization. This definition has little in common with the conventional usage of "professionalism," in every-day speech, as a synonym for "competence" or "qualification." The reader should note that whether professional participation and attitudes are associated, positively or negatively, with competence or effectiveness, is an empirical question that is quite beyond the scope of this study. When some administrators are described as having a "professional orientation" to a greater degree than others, or as "participating to a greater extent in professional activities," these descriptions are factual accounts of their self-reported attitudes and behaviors. These attitudes and behaviors should *not* be taken to reflect in any way the effectiveness with which they administer their organizations.

Sociologists define professionalism as a form of self-organization by practitioners of an occupation that enables them to defend the importance of their contribution and the legitimacy of their decisions. What Magali Sarfatti Larsen has called "the professional project" involves the development by practitioners of a cognitive basis for specialism that is seen as unique and not easily learned; the development of university programs, run by professionals, that control the certification of practitioners; the emergence of professional associations and the consignment to peers of the right to admit individuals to the practice of an occupation and to set and enforce ethical standards; and the establishment of at least some autonomy of professionals from the organizations in which they are employed.[1]

In this view, professionalism has two sides, one ideological and cognitive, the other behavioral and organizational. The function of the former is to establish the legitimacy of professional claims to authority, autonomy, and expertise. The role of the latter is to provide a framework in which professionals can interact with their peers, learn about new developments in their fields, develop reputations that can aid them in seeking professional advancement, and contribute to the public acceptance of their professional claims to expertise and authority.

With respect to the first, the set of attitudes associated with professionalism usually includes the following:

1. Claims to authority on the basis of knowledge and expertise;
2. Belief that the expertise required for professional practice cannot be obtained solely through formal means;
3. A commitment to the importance of university training programs that provide credentials requisite for entry into the field;
4. The belief that professional standards can best be set and enforced by other professionals;
5. A commitment to these professional standards, extending to a willingness to place the common good of the profession above the specific good of the employing organization when these interests conflict; and
6. A concurrent commitment to the community of professionals, involving orientations that are "cosmopolitan" rather than "local".[2]

With regard to the second, behavioral components of professionalism include:

---

[1] Magali Sarfatti Larsen. *The Rise of Professionalism*. 1977. Berkeley: University of California Press.

[2] Alvin W. Gouldner, "Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles - I." 1957. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 2,2:281-306.

1. Participation in professional activities and organizations, particularly regional and national professional associations;
2. Reading periodicals and other materials about the profession and professional practice;
3. Acquisition of university training for professional practice;
4. Attendance at professional conferences and similar gathering; and
5. Maintenance of strong ties and friendships with professionals employed in other organizations than one's own.

Several sets of questions to which the administrators responded bear on the issue of professionalism, as so defined. With respect to the behavioral side of professionalism, respondents were asked whether or not they participated in a range of professional activities, including: membership in service and professional associations; service as officers, board members, or committee members in such associations; service on federal, state, and local government arts-related panels and commissions; attendance at professional and service-organization conferences; reading of periodicals related to their work; and friendship with other professionals. With regard to the cognitive aspects of professionalism, respondents were asked to rate the importance of various qualities of top administrators in their fields; to evaluate the importance of several goals for service or professional organizations; and to choose among a set of alternative statements reflecting attitudes towards the manager's role in his or her organization and field.

Questions differed from field to field, were based on reports in professional periodicals and discussions with managers, and were reviewed by administrators, policy makers, and service organization staff. In several cases, opinion questions were modelled on standard items that had been used in other research on professionalism.[3] The first part of this chapter is devoted to behavioral, the second to attitudinal, professionalism.

Participation in Professional Activities

Administrators in each field were asked whether or not they had participated in a wide range of professional activities.[4] Patterns of participation in the four fields are described in Table 2.

Administrators in all fields reported engaging in a wide range of professional activities. As a group, art-museum directors reported a somewhat broader and orchestra managers a somewhat narrower range of activities than administrators in other fields. In addition to their principal service organizations, almost half of the theatre managing directors were members of the League of Resident Theatres (LORT). Almost three quarters of the art-museum directors belonged to the Association of Art Museum Directors (AAMD) and almost one half belonged to the College Art Association (CAA). Two thirds of the community arts agency (CAA) directors reported membership in the American Council for the Arts (ACA) and one third were members of the Association of College, University, and Community Arts Administrators (ACUCAA).

Relatively few administrators in any field reported serving as officers, board, or committee members of such organizations, Just over 10 percent of the theatre administrators had served during the previous five years on the LORT Board and one in six had served on a LORT

---

[3] Richard H. Hall, "Professionalization and bureaucratization." 1968. *American Sociological Review* 33,1:92-104; William E. Snizek, "Hall's professionalism scale: An empirical reassessment. 1972. *American Sociological Review* 37,1:109-14; Harold L. Wilensky, "The Professionalization of Everyone?" 1964. *American Journal of Sociology* 70,5:137-58.

[4] These questions are reproduced in Table 1.

Committee. One in six of the art-museum directors had been an officer of the AAMD and more than half reported serving on an AAMD committee. Almost 14 percent of the orchestra managers had served on the American Symphony Orchestra League (ASOL) board and more than 20 percent on an ASOL committee during the previous five years. One in ten CAA directors reported serving on the NACAA board and almost one in five on a NACAA committee. Some managers in all fields also reported serving in state or regional service or professional organizations.

All but the CAA directors were asked about their participation on federal grant-review panels.[5] Many art museum directors, but relatively few performing-arts managers, reported involvement in the panel process. Almost two in five art-museum directors reported serving on panels of the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) Museum Program during the previous five years, compared to fewer than 10 percent of the orchestra or theatre administrators who had served on their respective discipline panels. More than a quarter of the art-museum directors had served on other NEA panels, compared to fewer than one tenth of the performing-arts managers. What is more, a third of the art-museum directors reported serving as reviewers or panelists for the National Endowment for the Humanities and almost a quarter reported reviewing for or advising the Institute for Museum Services. The reason for the differences between museum and performing-arts administrators would seem to be that art-museum directors are the central actors in their institutions, commanding (with only a few exceptions) primary responsibility for both the art-historical and administrative functions. By contrast, although many theatre and orchestra managers are experienced in drama or music, artistic directors play the prime aesthetic roles in their organizations.

---

[5] At the time of the survey, no federal program explicitly aimed at supporting CAAs was in place.

Nonetheless, at the state level, performing-arts managers do frequently serve on peer-review panels. Almost one third of the theatre managing directors and over one fifth of the orchestra managers reported serving on state arts agency (SAA) discipline panels; and two fifths of the art-museum directors reported having served on SAA museum panels. CAA directors were most involved in SAA panels of all, with almost one half reporting that they had served on an SAA panel during the past five years. CAA directors were also more likely than administrators in the other fields to report having served on some other state government panel, commission, or committee concerned with the arts.

In summary, the administrators who responded to the surveys worked in a wide variety of capacities that took them beyond the bounds of their own institutions. Many of their activities were regional, national, or state-level in focus. Some involved association with other professional arts administrators; others involved contact with government agencies; still others brought them into contact with universities, community organizations, and the broader public. National-level panel participation was most common for the art-museum directors, most of whom were art historians. Art-museum directors were more likely than others to report advising businesses and foundations about their giving to the arts, lecturing at universities, and serving on professional association committees. Managers from all fields were active on state arts agency panels and in state and regional professional associations, and were substantially involved in university and workshop lecturing, as well as other activities. CAA directors reported being especially involved at the local and state levels in both public-sector and private-sector arts activities.

Other Forms of Behavioral Professionalism

In this section, we shall examine the extent to which respondents reported attending conferences of managers and others in their field; reading professional and related publications; and choosing their friends from among professional colleagues.

Conference Attendance

Patterns of conference attendance varied from field to field, in part depending upon the number and frequency of events. (See Table 3.) Most top administrators in all fields had attended, during the previous five years, at least one meeting of their field's primary service organization, from about two thirds of the art museum directors who had attended meetings of the American Association of Museums (AAM) and an equal proportion of theatre managing directors reporting attendance at national meetings of the Theatre Communications Group (TCG); to over three quarters of the CAA respondents who had been to at least one NACAA national convocation; to fully 89 percent of the orchestra managers who had attended one or more ASOL national conferences. The latter were most likely by far to report attending national conferences regularly, with over half having been to four or five national ASOL conferences between 1976 and 1980.

In all these fields, other meetings also attracted respondents during the previous five years. More than half of the theatre managing directors had attended conferences of the Foundation for the Extension and Development of the American Professional Theatre (FEDAPT), almost half had attended an annual meeting of LORT, and nearlyone half had attended a state or regional theatre conference. Almost two thirds of the art-museum directors reported having attended one or more AAMD annual meetings, just over half had attended a national conference of the College Art Association, and almost half reported attending a convocation of a state or regional museum association. More than half of the CAA directors had attended a conference of the American Council for the Arts and a similar percentage had been to at least one ACUCAA conference. Nearly three quarters of the orchestra managers reported having attended one or more of ASOL's regional workshops. In sum, although the fields varied in the extent to which conference attendance was focussed on a single national service association, arts administrators were active attenders of conferences that enabled them to develop their professional skills and extend their professional networks.

Periodical Reading

A more passive form of engagement in a professional community is the reading of periodicals that treat issues important to one's field. Respondents were asked whether they read selected lists of periodicals "never," "occasionally," or "regularly." Table 4 displays the percentage of respondents from each field who reported reading "regularly" the periodicals about which they were asked. These periodicals included some, like the newsletters and magazines of the service organizations, that carried articles about management, artistic accomplishments, and personnel movements within each field. Others (for example, *Theatre* or *Art Journal*) emphasized artistic developments. Still others (*Cultural Post* or *Arts Reporting Service*) focussed on the relationship between government and the arts. And a few provided general coverage of the arts (e.g., *Sunday New York Times Arts and Leisure Section*).

Most administrators in every field reported reading regularly the publications of their primary service organization, from between just over half of the art-museum directors who reported regular reading of the AAM's *Museum News* to nearly all of the orchestra managers who reported reading ASOL's *Symphony* on a regular basis. Managers varied in the extent to which they read periodicals of largely aesthetic interest, from just 10 percent of the theatre managing directors reading *Theatre* regularly to over one quarter of the art-museum directors reporting regular readership of *Art Bulletin*.

Respondents also varied in the extent to which they read other materials relevant to their fields or to the arts in general. For example, more than a third of the theatre managing directors reported reading weekly *Variety* on a regular basis, compared to just a handful of the orchestra managers (who were even less likely to report reading *Billboard*, which covers recording industry news). About half of the CAA directors reported reading *American Arts* regularly, compared to just about one in eight of the administrators in the other fields. Orchestra managers and CAA directors were most likely, and art-museum directors least likely, to read *Cultural Post* and the *Arts Reporting Service*, while performing-arts administrators were the most devoted reported readers of the American Arts Alliance's Legislative Reports.

Friendships

Professions are commonly believed to absorb more of the individual's time and commitment than other occupations. Consequently, respondents were asked "Of your five closest friends, how many work in your own field?"

Administrators of the resident theatres were striking more likely to recruit their closest friends from among their colleagues than were managers in other fields. Over 40 percent of the managing directors, compared to about one sixth to one quarter of other respondents reported that three to five of their closest friends worked in their field. Only about 10 percent of the theatre administrators found none of their five closest friends involved in their field, compared to 30 to 40 percent of the managers of orchestra, art museums, and community arts agencies. Given the high average levels of professional experience among the art-museum directors, their responses were somewhat surprising. The high degree of intra-field friendship among the theatre managing directors may be related to the greater geographical concentration of theatre activity than of resources in the others fields where managers were surveyed.

Variation in Behavioral Professionalism by Cohort and Organization Size

In all four fields, seniority and professional participation were found to be strongly linked in some respects and unrelated in others. In general, the link between experience and participation was strongest among the orchestra managers and weakest among the art-museum directors. In all the disciplines, the more senior managers were far more likely than others to report participation as officers, board members, or committee members in national service organizations or on national panels. In all fields, as well, differences in participation in state and regional activities by cohort were far smaller than at the national level (although, among the orchestra managers, such differences remained notable). By contrast, local-level activities were sometimes favored by members of the more recent cohorts.

More senior managers were more likely to attend national conferences among the theatre managing directors, museum directors, and CAA directors, but not among the orchestra managers. The most junior cohorts of orchestra managers and CAA directors, but not theatre managing directors, were somewhat less likely to read many periodicals than were their more senior colleagues.

The art-museum field varied markedly in that the range of participation in the junior cohort was far greater than that of junior cohorts in other fields, particularly with regard to invited or appointive positions. Indeed, the relative newcomers were more likely than others to have served as reviewers or advisors for the National Institute of Museum Services. Nonetheless, the more junior directors were less likely than others to attend AAM conferences and to read *Museum News*. There may be three reasons for these differences. First, members of the junior cohort of art-museum directors had been top executives longer than had administrators in the most junior cohort in any other field. To the extent that time (rather than position in a queue) is related to participation, they would be likely to participate more. Second, cohort was less closely related to organization size in the art museum field than in any others; to the extent that individuals in larger organizations participate more than managers of smaller ones, we would expect junior-cohort art-museum directors to be less affected. Finally, the most recent entrants to art-museum directorships were more likely than their predecessors to hold Ph.D.s and to have taught in universities: their professional commitments may have been directed more to the worlds of art history and *art* museums than to the museum world more generally.

Findings about the relationship between organization budget size and professional participation were similar to those on differences related to tenure in the field. In general, for all fields, the wider the geographic scope of an activity and the greater the extent to which participation was invited rather than voluntary, the greater the tendency for managers of larger organizations to participate more than smaller. This tendency was exceptionally strong in the orchestra and, to a lesser extent, community-arts fields, and weakest, although still notable, among the museum directors.

For example, managing directors of small theatres were no less likely to participate in state, local and regional activities, to attend local or regional conferences, or to read widely in professional periodicals than were directors of larger theatres. Art-museum size was unrelated to director participation in NEA panels other than those of the Museum Program, or to reviewing for the Humanities Endowment or the Museum Services Institute; and to attendance at AAM meetings. Indeed, directors of smaller museums were more likely than those of larger museums to be involved in many state and local activities (including membership in SAA panels). Somewhat surprisingly, directors of the larger museums were less likely to report reading widely in their field's periodical literature and recruiting many of their friends from the museum field than were directors of smaller museums. It is possible that directors of large museums are so well integrated into the field that they do not need to read to keep up with events; but it is also possible that participation in the university-centered world of art history has created stronger professional networks among directors of small museums (many of which are university museums) than among directors of larger institutions.

By contrast, professional participation was strongly related to organization size among the CAA directors and the orchestra managers. In the case of the former, it may be that, in the absence of major variation in experience in the field, organizational budgets are the principal axis of differentiation: Thus directors of large CAAs were more active not just at the national level but also in most state and local activities; and more active not just in invited activities but with respect to voluntary conference attendance as well. In the orchestra field, managers of the smallest orchestras were less integrated into the field with respect to every measure of participation but membership in SAA panels other than orchestra panels and certain local activities. Managers of the smallest orchestras were less likely to attend national ASOL meetings (but not ASOL regional workshops), to read regularly most of the publications about which they were asked, and to report that many of their closest friendships were with other participants in the orchestra field.

In summary, then, more experienced managers and administrators participated more actively in professional activities in all fields, expecially when those activities were national in scope or invited (or elective) rather than voluntary. In most fields, younger managers and those of smaller organizations appeared active in state and local affairs, suggesting an informal apprenticeship system with informal inter-organizational professional careers. This system appeared strongest in the art-museum field, where differences in participation between directors of different-size organizations and different levels of experience were weakest, and weakest in the orchestra field, where such differences were strongest and where managers of the smallest organizations were also less integrated than others in terms of several informal and voluntary forms of professional participation.[6]

---

[6] Indices of participation were summed to create a composite "professional activism" scale and subjected to regression analysis to assess the relative impacts of several determinants of participation net of one another. These analyses, which are reported in full in the preliminary report of this study, revealed that three factors - operating budget, years of experience, and salary -- accounted for most of the explained variation in participation in every field.

Attitudinal Professionalism

In this section, we investigate the extent to which the responses of managers to questions about their attitudes towards specific policy and management questions reflect beliefs or dispositions conventionally associated with professionalism in the social-science literature. The reader should recall that no judgments are intended about the value of the attitudes described or about the likely effectiveness of administrators espousing or not espousing such attitudes. The purpose here is simply to assess the extent to which respondents expressed allegiance to views of their jobs consistent with cognitive orientations in other occupations that have come to be regarded as "professions."

Professional attitudes are characterized by claims about both individual practitioners and about the occupational community as a whole. With respect to the individual practitioner, professionalism includes 1) an emphasis on expertise as the basis of authority; 2) claims of altruism, disinterestedness, or public spiritedness; and 3) a view of career advancement through professional practice in several organizations rather than through promotion in a single organization.[7] With respect to the occupational community, professionalism is characterized by 1) loyalty to professional community and standards above loyalty to one's employer; 2) empahsis on collective action of professionals to enforce professional ethical standards; and 3) commitment to use professional associations to increase the legitimacy of professionals with the general public and with specific constituencies, including government.

---

[7] Fred H. Goldner and Richard R. Ritti, "Professionalism as career immobility." 1967. *American Journal of Sociology* 72, 5: 489-502.

Tables 5 through 7 describe the questions that tapped these individual and collective components of professional attitudes. The first question (Table 5) requested managers' assessments of the relative importance of several criteria that could be used to select the chief administrator of an organization like their own. The second question (Table 6) asked administrators to rate the relative importance of a number of functions that service organizations might perform in their field. The third set of questions (Table 7) contained several paired statements between which respondents had to choose.

At the individual level, respondents' attitudes towards the importance of managerial expertise were tapped by their ratings of management experience, formal training in administration, ability to prepare a budget, marketing experience, grantsmanship ability, and private fund-raising ability as managerial qualifications. They were reflected as well in respondents' ratings (for service organizations) of the importance of keeping managers informed about new administrative techniques and providing training opportunities. Two forced-choice pairs also addressed the issue of managerial expertise: one asking respondents to assess the relative importance of artistic and administrative experience as background for jobs like their own; and one (asked only to orchestra and CAA administrators) about the relative utility of volunteers and trained paid employees.[8] The emphasis in professionalism on disinterestedness and altruism was tapped by a forced-choice question asking the respondent to assess the extent to which professional administrators in his or her field are motivated by extrinsic, as opposed to financial, rewards. Finally, the focus on interorganizational careers was addressed in the question about service organizations, which asks respondents to assess the importance of enhancing career opportunities as a service-organization function.

---

[8] In such fields as social work, exponents of professionalism have opposed the use of volunteers on the grounds that they lack appropriate training and expertise. It should be noted that all of these questions tapped only attitudes towards *managerial* professionalism, and not artistic or scholarly forms of professionalism, as might be espoused by theatre artistic directors or academically oriented museum directors. This is yet another reason to avoid confusing professionalism, as defined here, with either effectiveness or virtue.

Several other questions focus upon the extent to which respondents felt a strong commitment to their professional community. Respondents were asked to rate the importance of "standing in the field" as a criterion for selecting top managers of an organization like their own. And they were asked, in the forced-choice format, to decide whether an administrator like themselves owes a responsibility to the field as a whole even when it runs against the short-range interests of his or her own institution. Willingness to vest social control over the activities of individual managers in the professional community was tapped by questions asking respondents to assess the importance, as functions of service organizations, of establishing standards of ethics for managers and of preventing unqualified persons from serving as arts administrators. In addition, museum directors were asked, in forced-choice format, about their attitudes towards museum accreditation; and, in a separate question, about the proper agency to enforce museum ethical standards. Finally, administrators' opinions about the use of service organizations to represent their profession to those outside their field were tapped by items in the service-organization question asking them to rate the importance of enhancing the public status of their organizations or profession, representing the field to public agencies, and advocating legislation in the interests of the arts.

Criteria for Selecting Administrators

Respondents in each field were requested to rate criteria for selecting a chief administrator for an organization like their own as "unimportant," "somewhat important," or "very important." Patterns of response were quite similar from field to field (Table 8). Management experience was rated "very important" by a large majority of respondents in each field. By contrast, fewer than one fifth of the respondents in any field considered formal training in administration to be "very important." Over four fifths of theatre, orchestra, and CAA administrators but just over half of the art-museum directors rated "ability to prepare a budget" as "very important." Just over half of the performing-arts administrators described marketing experience as very important.[9] Majorities of the theatre and CAA administrators reported that gransmanship ability was "very important," compared to just under half of the orchestra managers and just over one in four of the art-museum directors. (The latter were more likely to rate "private fund-raising ability" highly.) Fewer than one in ten of the theatre managing directors reported that "standing" in the field was a very important criterion, compared to almost one in five orchestra managers, one in four CAA directors, and more than one third of the art-museum directors.

Attitudes towards the importance of knowledge about or appreciation for artistic work varied from field to field. Over 80 percent of the theatre managing directors called "appreciation of the dramatic art" "very important," but only one in four said the same about "knowledge of the dramatic literature." Similarly, over four fifths of the orchestra managers thought it very important that a manager appreciate symphonic music, but fewer than one half felt it equally important that he or she have "knowledge of the symphonic repertoire." More than two thirds of the CAA directors thought "appreciation of the arts" a very important qualification for a job like their own. Just under two thirds of the art-museum directors called "connoisseurship" very important, compared to just under half rating "scholarship" that highly.

---

[9] This item was not included in the questionnaires for art-museum or CAA directors.

Given the diversity of missions and organizational structures among the four fields, the degree of consensus on the question of what makes a good manager was high. Administrators in all groups would choose replacements for themselves who had management experience; tact, refinement, and style; and the ability to prepare a budget; and who appreciated the work of the artists or artistic experts whom they managed. In none of these fields were respondents very concerned about the standing of candidates in the field as a whole, their experience in educational work, or whether they had received formal training in administration.

The Functions of Service Organizations

Respondents demonstrated similar consensus in their assessments of the importance of ten potential functions of service organizations in their fields (Table 9). On the whole, managers agreed strongly that service organizations should take stands on legislation relevant to their fields (from 72 percent of CAA directors to 87 percent of art-museum directors) and represent the field to public agencies concerned with the arts (from 72 percent of theatre managing directors to 83 percent of orchestra managers). Over two thirds of the performing-arts administrators also considered status-enhancement a "very important" function, compared to about 60 percent of the CAA directors and fewer than one half of the art-museum directors.

Next to representing their organizations collectively to government and the public, respondents reported that the training and education role of service organizations was most important. Two thirds of the orchestra managers and CAA directors and over one half of the theatre managing directors responded that providing training opportunities for managers was a "very important" function; and more than two thirds of the orchestra managers, three fifths of the theatre managing directors, and over half of the CAA directors thought it very important that service organizations keep members abreast of current management techniques. Art-museum directors were much less likely to favor the management-education role for service organizations.

Relatively few respondents in any field called preventing unqualified persons from holding jobs (an important function in the classic professions of medicine and law) "very important" (from 14 percent of the theatre manging directors to 24 percent of the CAA directors); but a larger percentage in each group - just under half of the performing-arts administrators, just under two fifths of the CAA directors, and fully 96 percent of the art-museum directors - believed that service organizations were "very important" vehicles for setting standards of professional ethics.

If many of the art-museum directors looked towards their service organizations to set ethical standards, fewer were willing to let such associations enforce them. Almost half of the art-museum directors reported that ethical standards should be enforced by each museum's board of trustees. Slightly fewer would have them enforced by either the American Association of Museums (22 percent) or the Association of Art Museum Directors (20 percent), while almost one in eight suggested some recommended that such standards be enforced by government agencies that support museums.

Forced-Choice Responses

For each of the forced-choice questions, respondents were asked to choose one of two conflicting statements and, further, to indicate whether making the choice was "very difficult," "somewhat difficult," or "easy." Combining the choice and the estimate of difficulty yielded, for each question, a scale ranging from "1" (easy choice of first alternative) to "6" (easy choice of second alternative). Responses are described in Table 10.

Respondents were asked to choose between two statements, one of which asserted that "while business sense is useful, it is essential that" administrators in the respondent's discipline "have strong artistic backgrounds," while the other stressed the importance of "a strong background in management." Responses from 70 to 80 percent of all groups but the art-museum directors strongly favored the second (management) alternative. By contrast, three quarters of the art-museum directors chose the first (artistic-background) option. This striking difference reflected the art-historical backgrounds of most art-museum directors and indicated that the professional allegiance of most art-museum directors.

Asked to choose between one statement asserting that "nonmonetary rewards make up for the low salaries" of managers in their fields and another stating that "salaries are so low . . . that many dedicated managers are leaving the field for more remunerative work," more than half of the (better paid) art-museum and orchestra administrators, compared to about 40 percent of the theatre managing directors and just over one in five CAA directors, chose the first option. Respondents were also asked to choose between one statement asserting that administrators of several kinds of arts organizations were members of the same profession and a second that "I find that I have little in common" with members of these other groups. The reference group for theatre and orchestra administrators was managers in all of the performing arts; for art-museum directors, it was people in all kinds of museums; and for the CAA directors, it included administrators of all kinds of arts organizations. CAA directors and orchestra managers were most inclusive, with more than 90 percent of each choosing the first alternative, as did nearly as many theatre administrators. By contrast, almost half of the art-museum directors reported having "little in common" with directors of other kinds of museums.

Respondents were asked to choose between a statement that an administrator should always act in the best interest of his or her organization, even when the action is not in the best interest of the field as a whole; and a second statement asserting the reverse. Only among the CAA directors did a majority of respondents choose the second, more classically professional, alternative. Majorities of the other respondents (from 58 percent of the art-museum directors to over three quarters of the orchestra managers) opted for the well-being of their organizations. (Fewer respondents in any discipline reported making this choice "easily" than any other forced-choice item described in this section.)

Orchestra managers and CAA directors were asked to choose between one statement asserting that volunteers are intrinsically valuable and another suggesting that they are a necessary evil that should eventually be replaced by paid staff; respondents in both fields favored the first (pro-volunteer) choice almost unanimously. Similarly, more than 90 percent of the art-museum directors chose a statement favoring museum accreditation over one opposing it.

Variation by Cohort

Newcomers to the resident stage differed from more senior managers in several respects. They were less likely than more senior managing directors to consider knowledge of the dramatic literature a very important qualification for their job: only 10 percent compared to more than one third. By contrast, one in five of the most junior cohort, but no respondents among the most senior, considered formal training in administration to be very important. The more junior managing directors also accorded somewhat greater importance to the service-organization functions of keeping managers abreast of recent management techniques and providing training opportunities. The percentage of respondents who selected the artistic-background versus the management-background forced-choice response also declined steadily with cohort: Almost one third of the most senior managing directors held artistic experience to be more important than management background, compared to less than a quarter of the middle cohort and just 13 percent of the most recent entrants. In short, these patterns appear to represent a growing managerial orientation on the part of more recent entrants to the field of theatre administration, consistent with the changes in training and background described in earlier chapters.

The responses of the junior cohort of art-museum directors reflected similar changes in that field. The most recent entrants were less likely (just over 50 percent, compared to about two thirds each in the earlier cohorts) to call connoisseurship a "very important" criterion for selecting a director; and almost one quarter (compared to none of the most senior directors) rated formal training in administration as "very important." The importance accorded fund-raising and budgeting as qualifications also rose monotonically with cohort.[10] The most junior directors were also twice as likely (one half compared to one quarter) to stress the importance for service organizations of "keeping museum professionals abreast of current management techniques." What is more, just two thirds of the two more recent cohorts' members, compared to more than 90 percent of the most senior directors, regarded scholarly and curatorial backgrounds as more important for directors than managerial backgrounds (the forced-choice item).

Although the orientation of the less senior directors was more managerial than that of their more senior colleagues, it was not more professional, in the classical sense. The more junior directors were less supportive of the social-control and representation functions of service organizations, for example. Fewer would have service organizations keep unqualified persons out of museum jobs or represent the field to public arts agencies. Moreover, they were substantially more likely to vest responsibility for enforcement of ethical standards in each museum's board of trustees, while the most senior directors were more likely (31 percent compared to less than 20 percent) to vest responsibility in the American Association of Museums. The most junior directors were also somewhat more likely than the most senior (two thirds compared to one half) to report that they would act in the interests of their institution when those interests conflicted with the interests of the museum field.

---

[10] More than fifty percent of the junior cohort, rated "commitment to outreach" a "very important" criteria: twice as many as in the most senior cohort and five times the percentage in the middle cohort.

Is managerial professionalism increasing in the art-museum field? The answer is mixed. A notable minority of more recent entrants to the field displayed a stronger orientation towards the managerial aspect of their work; yet they were somewhat less likely than more senior directors to provide traditionally professional responses to questions about collective control and responsibility. At least a minority of the less senior directors, but virtually none of the most senior, apparently embraced a conception of their job that was as similar to that of performing-arts administrators as it was to traditional notions of museum professionalism.

The attitudes of orchestra managers varied less dramatically by cohort than those of art-museum and resident-theatre administrators, but displayed, in more modest form, the same tendency towards an increase in managerial orientation. Little systematic variation was revealed among the CAA directors (for whom each cohort covered far fewer years than those in the other fields).

Summary

Did the arts administrators display a "professional orientation" (in the sense described earlier) towards their work as managers? The responses elude easy labels. In no field did respondents as a group endorse all of the traditional components of the professional belief system. For example, most respondents (except for art-museum directors) considered management training and education an important role of service organizations; yet they rejected formal management training (and the credentials that go with it) as an important criterion for selecting administrators for jobs like their own. Except for the art-museum directors, respondents expressed little interest in the collective social-control potential of service or professional organizations. And, except for the CAA directors, most chose, in principal, to act in the best interests of their organizations when those interests conflicted with those of their fields. On the other hand, the respondents appeared to be appreciative of the value of collective mobilization to pursue broadly political ends: supporting legislation, negotiating with government agencies, and enhancing public images. In short, in some respects the responses of these administrators conformed to the professional model and in other respects they diverged sharply.

This combination of convergence and divergence was most striking among the art-museum directors, whose responses were least like those of the other respondents. Art-museum directors placed less stock in formal management training than any other group, both as a criterion for hiring directors and as a function of service organizations. Yet they were most supportive of the role of service organizations in establishing (and, for a large minority, enforcing) professional ethical standards.

In the art-museum, theatre, and, to a lesser extent, the orchestra fields, a trend towards increasing managerialism could be noted in the responses of members of different cohorts, although, in the former at least, administrative orientations were reflected in the responses of only a minority of respondents. Among the art-museum directors, the increased managerialism was accompanied by a modest decline in support for traditional tenets of professionalism.

Table 1: Participation Questions for Each Discipline

Theatres

ARE YOU OR YOUR INSTITUTION CURRENTLY A MEMBER OF ANY OF THE FOLLOWING ORGANIZATIONS?

Theatre Communications Group (TCG) * (A)

League of Resident Theatres (1)

A state or regional theatre association (2)

The board of trustees of a resident theatre other than your own? **(B)

The board of trustees of any other arts organization besides a resident theatre (3)

DURING THE LAST FIVE YEARS, HAVE YOU DONE ANY OF THE FOLLOWING?

Lectured on arts administration at a university program (4)

Lectured on arts administration at a conference or workshop program (5)

Lectured on artistic aspects of drama or the stage at a university ***(C)

Lectured on artistic aspects of drama or the stage at a theatre other than your own ***(D)

Served as a consultant to any business association about their giving to the arts ***(E)

Served as a foundation consultant or member of a foundation panel involved in giving to the arts or to artists ***(F)

DURING THE LAST FIVE YEARS, HAVE YOU SERVED IN ANY OF THE FOLLOWING CAPCITIES?

As an officer of the Theatre Communications Group (TCG)? **(G)

As a member of the TCG Board (6)

On any TCG committees **(H)

As an officer of the League of Resident Theatres (7)

On the LORT Board (8)

On any LORT committees (9)

As an officer of the Foundation for the Extension and Development of the American Professional Theatre (FEDAPT) **(I)

As a member of the FEDAPT Board **(J)

Table 1 (con.)

On any FEDAPT Committees (10)

As an officer of the Theatre Development Fund (TDF) **(K)

As a member of the TDF Board **(L)

On any TDF committees **(M)

DURING THE LAST FIVE YEARS, HAVE YOU SERVED IN ANY OF THE FOLLOWING CAPACITIES?

As a member of a National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) Theatre Panel (11)

As a member of any other NEA panel (12)

On a National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) panel **(N)

On any other federal-government, arts-related panel, commission, or committee **(O)

As a member of a state arts agency theatre panel (13)

As a member of any other panel of a state arts agency (14)

As a member of any other state-government, arts-related panel, committee, or commission ***(P)

As an officer or council member of a state or regional theatre association (15)

As a member or active participant on a community arts council (16)

On any other community-level (public or private) arts-related committee, commission, or panel ***(Q)

As a member of the board of directors or executive council of a community-level united fund drive for the arts or similar organization **(R)

As a paid consultant to another nonprofit theatre (17)

Art Museums

ARE YOU CURRENTLY A MEMBER OF ANY OF THE FOLLOWING ORGANIZATIONS?

American Association of Museums *(A)

Association of Art Museum Directors (1)

College Art Association (2)

A state museum association (3)

A regional museum association (4)

The board of trustees or advisory board of an art museum other than your own (5)

The board of trustees or advisory board of any other arts organizations, besides an art museum (6)

Table 1 (con.)

DURING THE LAST FIVE YEARS, HAVE YOU DONE ANY OF THE FOLLOWING?

Lectured on museums or arts administration at a university program (7)

Lectured on museums or arts administration at a workshop program (8)

Lectured about art history at a university ***(B)

Lectured about art history at a museum other than your own ***(C)

Served as a consultant to any business or business association about their giving to the arts ***(D)

Served as a foundation consultant or member of a foundation panel involved in giving to the arts or to artists ***(E)

Served as a paid consultant to a museum other than your own (9)

Served as an officer of the American Association of Museums (AAM) **(F)

Served as a member of the AAM Council **(G)

Served on any AAM Committees (10)

Served as an officer of the Association of Art Museum Directors (AAMD) (11)

Served on any AAMD Committees (12)

Served as an officer of the College Art Association (CAA) **(H)

Served as a member of the CAA board **(I)

Served on any CAA Committees **(J)

Served as a member of the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) Museum Panel (either policy or grants) (13)

Served as a member of any other NEA panel (14)

Served as a reviewer or panel member for the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) (15)

DURING THE LAST FIVE YEARS, HAVE YOU SERVED IN ANY OF THE FOLLOWING CAPACITIES?

As a reviewer or member of an advisory committee of the National Institute of Museum Services (16)

On any other federal-government, arts-related panel, commission, or committee? ***(K)

As a member of a state arts agency panel (17)

Table 1 (con.)

As a member of any other panel of a state arts agency (18)

As a member of any other state-government, arts-related panel, committee, or commission ***(L)

As an officer or council member of a state museum association (19)

As an officer or council member of a regional museum association (20)

As a member or active participant on a community arts council (21)

On any other community-level (public or private) arts-related committee, commission or panel ***(M)

As a member of the board of directors or executive council of a community-level united fund drive for the arts or similar organization (22)

Orchestras

ARE YOU OR YOUR ORGANIZATION CURRENTLY A MEMBER OF ANY OF THE FOLLOWING ORGANIZATIONS?

American Symphony Orchestra League (ASOL) *(A)

A state or regional orchestra association (1)

An association of orchestra managers (2)

The board of trustees of an orchestra other than your own **(B)

The board of trustees of any other arts organization, besides an orchestra (3)

DURING THE LAST FIVE YEARS, HAVE YOU DONE ANY OF THE FOLLOWING?

Lectured on arts administration at a university program (4)

Lectured on arts administration at a workshop program (5)

Lectured on music at a university ***(C)

Served as a consultant to any business or business association about giving to the arts ***(D)

DURING THE LAST FIVE YEARS, HAVE YOU SERVED IN ANY OF THE FOLLOWING CAPACITIES?

As an officer of the Board of the American Symphony Orchestra League (ASOL) **(E)

As a member of the ASOL Board of Directors (6)

As a member of a National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) Music Panel (7)

As a member of any other NEA panel **(F)

Table 1 (con.)

On a National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) panel **(G)

On any other federal-government, arts-related panel, commission, or committee **(H)

As a foundation consultant or member of a foundation panel involved in giving to the arts or to artists ***(I)

As a member of a state arts agency music panel (8)

As a member of any other state-government arts-related panel, committee or commission (J)

As a member of any other panel of a state arts agency (9)

As a member or active participant on a community arts council (10)

On any other community-level (public or private) arts related committee, or panel ***(K)

As a member of the board of directors or executive council or a community level united fund drive for the arts or similar organization **(L)

Community arts agencies

ARE YOU CURRENTLY A MEMBER OF ANY OF THE FOLLOWING ORGANIZATIONS?

National Assembly of Community Arts Agencies (NACAA) *(A)

Association of College, University, and Community Arts Administrators (ACUCAA) (1)

American Council for the Arts (ACA) (2)

Neighborhood Arts Programs National Organizing Committee (NAPNOC) (3)

A state or regional association of community arts agencies or administrators (4)

The board of a community arts agency (CAA) other than your own (5)

The board of any other arts organizations, besides a CAA (6)

DURING THE LAST FIVE YEARS, HAVE YOU DONE ANY OF THE FOLLOWING?

Lectured on arts administration at a university program (7)

Lectured on arts administration at a workshop program (8)

Lectured on the community arts at a university ***(B)

Lectured on the community arts at a workshop program ***(C)

Table 1 (con.)

DURING THE LAST FIVE YEARS, HAVE YOU SERVED IN ANY OF THE FOLLOWING CAPACITIES?

As an officer of NACAA (9)

As a member of the NACAA Board (10)

On any NACAA Committees (11)

As an officer of ACA **(D)

As a member of the ACA Board **(E)

On any ACA Committees (12)

As an officer of ACUCAA **(F)

As a member of the ACUCAA Board **(6)

On any ACUCAA Committees **(H)

On any federal-government, arts-related panel, commission, or committee, other than an NEA panel ***(I)

As a member of a state arts agency panel (13)

As a member of any other state-government arts-related panel, committee, or commission ***(J)

On any community-level (public or private) arts-related committee, commission, or panel ***(K)

As a consultant to any business or business association about their giving to the arts ***(L)

As a foundation consultant or member of a foundation panel involved in giving to the arts or to artists ***(M)

As a member of the board of directors or executive council for a community-level united fund drive for the arts or similar organization (14)

As a paid consultant to another community arts agency (15)

Note: Numbers and letters in parentheses after questions refer to codes used in subsequent tables for that discipline. Where there is a letter, frequency breakdowns by the control variables were not performed for one of the following reasons:

*Nearly all respondents indicated participating;
**Nearly all respondents indicated that they did not participate;
***Responses to questions included too many non-comparable activities for response pattern to be meaningful.

Table 2: Managers' Participation by Discipline

Code	Theatres		Art Museums		Orchestras		CAAs	
	A*	P**	A*	P**	A*	P**	A*	P**
SER1	A	98.04(102)	A	92.86 (126)	A	97.22(108)	A	93.94 (132)
SER2	1	43.16(95)	1	71.54 (123)			1	30.23 (129)
			2	45.97 (124)			2	65.12 (129)
							3	6.30 (127)
STR	2	62.63(99)	3	56.80 (125)	1	53.77(106)	4	69.23 (130)
			4	63.71 (124)	2	80.19(106)		
OFF1	G	1.96(102)	F	4.80 (125)	6	2.78(108)	9	4.58 (131)
BRD1	6	5.88 (96)	G	6.35 (126)	5	13.89(108)	10	10.61 (132)
COM1	H	3.96 (97)	10	20.64 (126)	7	22.02(108)	11	18.32 (131)
OFF2	7	8.82(102)	11	16.80 (125)			D	0.76 (132)
BRD2	8	11.88(101)					E	2.29 (131)
COM2	9	16.67(102)	12	57.14 (125)			12	9.16 (131)
OFF3	I	0.00(101)					F	0.00 (131)
BRD3	J	0.00(101)	I	2.38 (126)			G	1.53 (131)
COM3	10	8.91	J	7.94 (126)			H	2.27 (132)
SOFF	15	20.79(101)	19	17.46 (126)				
			20	15.70 (121)				
AAU	4	53.92(102)	7	78.57 (126)	4	46.30(108)	7	40.15 (132)
AAWS	5	73.53(102)	8	68.29 (123)	5	54.63(108)	8	75.76 (132)
ARTU	C	45.10(102)	B	64.00 (125)	C	13.89(108)	B	38.93 (131)
ARTW	D	30.69(101)	C	72.80 (125)			C	78.79 (132)
TRU1	B	6.00(100)	5	30.65 (124)	B	1.85(108)	5	21.71 (129)
TRU2	3	45.10(100)	6	72.00 (124)	3	47.66(107)	6	55.12 (127)
FOUN	F	10.20 (98)	E	30.08 (123)	I	3.74(107)	M	12.98 (131)
BUSN			D	59.35 (123)	D	22.22(108)	L	40.31 (129)
CAA	16	41.18(102)	21	43.09 (123)	11	53.70(108)		
UART	R	10.68(103)	22	15.87 (126)	J	8.41(107)	14	25.76 (132)
OTHC	Q	46.54(101)	M	68.00 (125)	K	42.45(106)	K	88.55 (131)
PCON	17	39.22(102)	9	28.80 (125)			15	48.46 (130)
NEAD	11	7.84(102)	13	38.10 (126)	8	9.26(108)		
NEAO	12	9.80(102)	14	25.81 (124)	F	5.56(108)		
NEH	N	0.00(101)	15	33.33 (126)	G	0.00(108)		
NIMS			16	23.81 (126)				
OTHF	O	9.00(100)	K	25.00 (124)	H	4.63(108)	I	17.42 (132)
SAAD	13	31.00(100)	17	38.71 (124)	9	22.22(108)		
SAAO	14	14.71(102)	18	25.41 (122)	10	10.38(106)	13	49.24 (132)
OTHS	P	18.63(102)	L	24.00 (125)	J	16.19(105)	J	49.62 (131)

*A=Detailed activity code, from Table 1.
**P=Percentage reporting activity in column A, to left.
"Code" is a generic code included to enable the reader to understand more easily the table, with reference to the key below. Each code provides

Table 2 (con.)

a general description of the activity for its respective row. Nonetheless, the reader is warned that question phrasing varies among disciplines for most of these questions; and she or he is encouraged to consult Table 1 for precise wordings. SER1=member, major service organization; SER2=member, second and subsequent service organizations; STR=member, state and/or regional service organizations; OFF1=officer of the first service organization; BRD1=board member, first service organization; COM1=committee member, first service organization; OFF2=officer, second service organization; BRD2=board member, second service organization; COM2=committee member, second service organization; OFF3=officer, third service organization; BRD3=board member, third service organization; COM3=committee member, third service organization; SOFF=officer or board, state and/or regional service organization; AAU=arts administration lecture at university; AAWS=arts administration lecture at workshop; ARTU=lecture on art form at university; ARTW=lecture on art form elsewhere; TRU1=trustee, similar arts organization; TRU2=trustee, other arts organization; FOUN=foundation arts consultant; BUSN=business arts consultant; CAA=active in community arts agency; UART=board of united arts fund; OTHC=other community arts committee; PCON=paid consultant to similar arts organization; NEAD=NEA panel, own discipline; NEAO=other NEA Panel; NEH=NEH panel; NIMS=NIMS reviewer; OTHF=other federal committee; SAAD=SAA panel, own discipline; SAAO=other SAA panel; OTHS=other state committee or commission.

Table 3: Managers' Conference Participation by Discipline*

Conference and Frequency	Percent Participating			
	Theatres	Art Museums	Orchestras	CAAs
TCG - 1 or more	67.65 (102)			
TCG - 3 or 4	15.69 (102)			
FEDAPT - 1 or more	51.96 (102)			
LORT - 1 or more	44.66 (103)			
LORT - 5	23.30 (103)			
State/regional - 1 or more	43.43 (99)			
AAM - 1 or more		64.80 (125)		
AAM - 4 to 5		15.20 (125)		
AAMD - 1 or more		62.70 (126)		
AAMD - 4 to 5		42.06 (126)		
CAA - 1 or more		53.97 (126)		
State/regional - 1 or more		48.41 (126)		
ASOL national - 1 or more			88.79 (107)	
ASOL national - 4 to 5			52.34 (107)	
ASOL regional - 1 or more			71.96 (107)	
ASOL regional - 4 to 5			10.28 (107)	
NACAA - 1 or more				77.88 (113)
NACAA - 3 to 5				17.70 (113)
ACA - 1 or more				59.29 (113)
ACA - 3 to 5				26.55 (113)
ACUCAA - 1 or more				24.78 (113)

*For theatre and orchestra conferences, questions specified "between 1976 and 1980," for museum conferences, question specified "during the last five years."

Table 4: Percentage of Managers Who Report Reading Regularly by Discipline

Periodical	Theatres	Art Museums	Orchestras	CAAs
AMERICAN ARTS	12.12 (99)	14.52 (124)	13.08 (107)	55.73 (131)
AAA LEGISLATIVE REPORTS	50.00 (100)	30.40 (125)	62.04 (108)	17.42 (132)
ART BULLETIN	NA	26.98 (126)	NA	NA
ART JOURNAL	NA	31.45 (124)	NA	NA
ART NEWS	NA	50.00 (126)	NA	NA
ARTS REPORTING SERVICE	14.00 (100)	14.40 (125)	27.10 (107)	34.09 (132)
AVISO	NA	68.00 (125)	NA	NA
BILLBOARD	NA	NA	3.74 (107)	NA
CULTURAL POST	29.00 (100)	10.40 (125)	37.04 (108)	46.97 (132)
INTERNATIONAL MUSICIAN	NA	NA	39.81 (108)	NA
MUSEUM NEWS	NA	57.14 (126)	NA	NA
MUSIC JOURNAL	NA	NA	15.89 (107)	NA
NACAA NEWSLETTER	NA	NA	NA	83.33 (132)
NAPNOC NOTES	NA	NA	NA	9.92 (131)
NASAA NEWSLETTER	NA	NA	NA	26.52 (132)
SENZA SORDINO	NA	NA	56.60 (106)	NA
SYMPHONY	NA	NA	93.52 (108)	NA
THEATRE	10.20 (98)	NA	NA	NA
THEATRE COMMUNICATIONS	79.00 (100)	NA	NA	NA
TIMES SUNDAY ARTS AND LEISURE	54.00 (100)	61.60 (125)	51.85 (108)	29.23 (130)
VARIETY (weekly)	36.00 (100)	NA	6.48 (108)	NA

Table 5: Wording of Items on Importance of Selected Director Qualifications[1]

Number	Theatres	Art Museums	Orchestras	CAAs	Short Form[2]
1.	Knowledge of the dramatic literature	Scholarship	Knowledge of the symphonic repertoire	Familiarity with the community arts scene nationally	ARTS
2.	Management experience	SAME	SAME	SAME	EXP
3.	Appreciation of the dramatic art	Connoisseurship	Appreciation of classical music	Appreciation of the arts	EXP
4.	Formal training in administration	SAME	SAME	SAME	ADMIN
5.	Tact, refinement, style	SAME	SAME	SAME	TACT
6.	Grantmanship ability	SAME	SAME	SAME	GRANT
7.	Private fund raising ability	SAME	SAME	NA	PRIV
8.	Training or experience in theatre education	Training or experience in museum education	Training or experience in music education	Training or experience in arts education	EDUC
9.	Ability to prepare a budget	SAME	SAME	SAME	BUDG
10.	Commitment to outreach	SAME	SAME	SAME	OUTR
11.	Standing within the resident theatre field	Standing within museum profession	Standing within the orchestra field	Standing within the community-arts field	STAND
12.	Marketing experience	NA	Marketing	NA	MARK

1. Question: If you were serving on a committee to select a new (title name) for a (organization type) like your own, how strongly would you weigh the following characteristics in evaluating candidates?
2. Short form will be used in subsequent titles.

Table 6: Wording of Items for Service-Organization Function Question[1]

Number	Theatres	Museums	Orchestras	CAAS	Short Form[2]
1.	Keeping members abreast of current management techniques	Keeping museum professionals abreast of current management techniques	Same as theatres	Same as theatres	MGMT
2.	Providing training opportunities for theatre administrators	Providing training opportunities for museum administrators	Providing training opportunities for orchestra administrators	Providing training opportunities for CAA administrators	TRAIN
3.	Enhancing the status of resident theatres in the eyes of the public	Enhancing the status of the museum profession in the eyes of the public	Enhancing the status of orchestras in the eyes of the public	Enhancing the status of CAAs in the eyes of the public	STATUS
4.	Initiating or taking stands on legislation in areas of interest to resident theatres	Initiating or taking stands on legislation in areas of interest to museums	Initiating or taking stands on legislation in areas of interest to orchestras	Initiating or taking stands on legislation in areas of interest to CAAs	LEGIS
5.	Setting standards of professional or managerial ethics	Setting standards of professional ethics	Setting standards of professional or managerial ethics	Setting standards of managerial ethics	ETHIC
6.	Preventing unqualified persons from serving as resident theatre administrators	Preventing unqualified persons from serving in museum jobs	Preventing unqualified persons from serving as orchestra managers	Preventing unqualified persons from serving as CAA directors	PREV
7.	Bringing together administrators from all the performing arts into one profession	Bringing together people from art, history, and science museums into one professional community	Same as Theatres	Bringing together administrators from private and public CAAS	BRING

Table 6 (cont'd)

Number	Theatres	Art Museums	Orchestras	CAAs	Short Form
8.	Exercising leadership to make theatres more relevant and accessible to disadvantaged groups	Exercising leadership to make museums more accessible and relevant to disadvantaged groups	Exercising leadership to make orchestras more relevant and accessible to disadvantaged groups	Exercising leadership to make CAA programming more relevant and accessible to disadvantaged groups	ACCS
9.	Facilitating career development through fostering contacts with other theatre administrators	Facilitating career development through fostering contacts with other museum professionals	Facilitating career development through fostering contacts with other orchestra administrators	Facilitating career development through fostering contacts with other CAA directors	FACIL
10.	Representing the resident-theatre field to state and federal agencies concerned with the arts	Representing the museum field to state and federal agencies concerned with the arts	Representing the orchestra field to state and federal agencies concerned with the arts	Representing the community arts field to state and federal agencies concerned with the arts	REPRE

1. Question: "The following is a list of functions that (your field's service organization) might serve for (managers in your position). How important should each of the following objectives be to service organizations in the (respondent's field).

2. Short form will be used in subsequent tables.

Table 7: Wording of forced choice questions

Number		Wording	Short Form
		THEATRES	
1.	1	While business sense is useful, it is essential that a theatre's managing director have a strong artistic background.	ARTS/MGMT
	2	While a managing director must be sensitive to artistic questions, it is crucial that he or she have a strong background in management.	
2.	1	Nonmonetary rewards make up for the low salaries of performing-arts administrators.	
	2	Salaries are so low in the performing arts today that many dedicated managers leave the field for more remunerative work.	REWARDS/PC
3.	1	Performing-arts administrators should realize that we are all part of the same profession, regardless of whether we work in theatres, orchestras, or dance.	SAME/PC
	2	I find that I have little in common with people who work in symphony orchestras or dance companies.	
4.	1	When the interests of a managing director's own theatre and those of the field as a whole diverge, it is the director's obligation to act in the interests of his or her own institution.	INST/FIELD
	2	Managing directors are theatre professionals: They owe a responsibility to the resident-theatre community even when it runs against the short-term interest of their own institution.	
		ART MUSEUMS	
1.	1	While business sense is useful, it is esssential that a museum director have a strong scholarly and curatorial background.	ARTS/MGMT
	2	While a museum director must be sensitive to artistic questions, it is crucial that he or she have a strong background in management.	
2.	1	Nonmonetary rewards make up for the low salaries in the art-museum field	REWARDS/PC

Table 7 (Cont'd)

Number	Wording		Short Form
	2	Salaries are so low in art museums today that many dedicated people leave the field for more remunerative work.	
3.	1	Museum workers should realize that we are all part of the same profession, regardless of whether we work at an art, history, or science museum	SAME/PC
	2	I find that I have little in common with people who work in history of science museums.	
4.	1	When the interests of a director's own museum and those of the field as a whole diverge, it is the director's obligation to act in the interests of his or her own institution.	INST/FIELD
	2	Directors are museum professionals: They owe a responsibility to the museum field even when it runs against the short-term interest of their own institution.	
5.	1	Accreditation of Museums in neither necessary or beneficial: Such efforts endanger the autonomy of museums and the diversity of the field.	ACCRED/CP
	2	By instituting accreditation procedures, museums have taken a large step towards developing a professional identity.	

ORCHESTRAS

Number	Wording		Short Form
1.	1	While business sense is useful, it is essential that orchestra managers have strong artistic backgrounds.	ARTS/MGMT
	2	While a manager must be sensitive to artistic questions, it is crucial that he or she have a strong background in management.	
2.	1	Nonmonetary rewards make up for the low salaries of performing-arts administrators.	REWARDS/PC
	2	Salaries are so low in the performing arts today that many dedicated managers leave the field for more remunerative work.	
3.	1	Performing-arts administrators should realize that we are all part of the same profession, regardless of whether we work in orchestras, theatres, or opera.	SAME/PC

Table 7 (Cont'd)

Number	Wording		Short Form
	2	I find that I have little in common with people who work in theatre or dance companies.	
4.	1	When the interests of a manager's own orchestra and those of the orchestra field as a whole diverge, it is the manager's obligation to act in the best interest of his or her institution.	INST/FIELD
	2	Managers are orchestra professionals: They owe a responsibility to the orchestra field even when it runs against the short-term interest of their own institution.	
5.	1	Volunteers are an important part of any orchestra, both for the work they accomplish and for the bridges they build between the orchestra and its community.	VOLS/PC
	2	Volunteers are usually a necessary evil: Orchestras should work toward replacing them with professional managers and paid staff...	
		COMMUNITY ARTS AGENCIES	
1.	1	While managerial experience is useful, it is essential that CAA directors have strong artistic backgrounds.	ARTS/MGMT
	2	While a CAA director must be sensitive to artistic questions, it is crucial that he or she have a strong background in management.	
2.	1	Nonmonetary rewards more than make up for the low salaries of community-arts adminsitrators.	REWARDS/PC
	2	Salaries are so low in the community arts today that many dedicated managers leave the field for more renumerative work.	
3.	1	Arts administrators should realize that we are all part of the same profession, whether we work in CAAs, theatres, or art museums	SAME/PC
	2	I find that I have little in common with people who work in theatres or art museums.	

Table 7 (Cont'd)

Number	Wording	Short Term
4.	1 When the interests of an adminstrator`s CAA and those of the community arts field as a whole diverge, it is the manager's obligation to act in the interest of his or her own agency.	INST/FIELD
	2 CAA administrators are community-arts professionals: They owe a responsibility to the community arts field even when it runs against the short term interest of their own agency.	
5.	1 Volunteers are an important part of any CAA, both for the work they accomplish and for the bridges they build between the CAA and the community.	VOLS/PC
	2 Volunteers are usually a necesssary evil: CAAs should rely soley on full-time professional management and staff.	

Table 8: Percentage of Respondents Reporting that Criteria for Choosing a New Director are 'Very Important,' by Discipline

Criteria		Theatres		Art Museums		Orchestras		CAAs	
1.	ARTS	24.27%	(103)	45.16	(124)	44.86	(107)	32.06	(131)
2.	EXP	74.19	(103)	85.61	(124)	85.85	(107)	92.23	(132)
3.	APP	83.50	(103)	64.23	(123)	82.24	(107)	67.42	(132)
4.	ADMIN	14.71	(102)	8.87	(124)	15.89	(107)	18.94	(132)
5.	TACT	81.55	(103)	88.71	(124)	90.57	(106)	75.76	(132)
6.	GRANT	61.17	(103)	28.46	(123)	46.73	(107)	56.06	(132)
7.	PRIV	58.25	(103)	49.59	(123)	42.99	(107)	NA	
8.	EDUC	3.88	(103)	12.20	(123)	8.49	(106)	9.85	(132)
9.	BUDG	85.44	(103)	56.45	(124)	86.92	(107)	81.06	(132)
10.	OUTR	36.89	(103)	26.83	(123)	46.73	(107)	58.78	(131)
11.	STAND	9.71	(103)	34.68	(124)	17.76	(107)	24.24	(132)
12.	MARK	51.46	(103)	NA		60.75	(107)	NA	

Table 9 : Percentage of Respondents Reporting Service Organization Functions `Very Important.' by Discipline

Functions	Theatres	Art Museums	Orchestras	CAAs
1. MGMT	61.39% (101)	43.59 (117)	71.03 (107)	54.20 (131)
2. TRAIN	53.47 (101)	30.77 (117)	65.74 (108)	67.42 (132)
3. STATUS	67.33 (101)	47.11 (121)	66.67 (108)	58.46 (130)
4. LEGIS	79.00 (100)	87.20 (125)	85.19 (108)	71.54 (130)
5. ETHIC	45.54 (101)	86.29 (124)	45.37 (108)	38.93 (131)
6. PREV	14.29 (98)	21.01 (119)	20.37 (108)	23.66 (131)
7. BRING	14.84 (101)	17.60 (125)	7.41 (108)	44.27 (131)
8. ACCS	18.81 (101)	18.40 (125)	23.15 (108)	38.17 (131)
9. FACIL	38.61 (101)	34.40 (125)	40.74 (108)	38.46 (130)
10. REPRE	72.78 (101)	75.20 (125)	83.18 (107)	78.29 (129)

Table 10 : Responses to Forced-Choice Questions[1]

Item	Resp	Theatres	Art Museums	Orchestras	CAAs
1. ARTS/MGMT	1-3	22.33%	75.00	30.84	20.61
	1	12.62	52.42	18.69	10.69
	6	51.46	10.48	46.73	56.49
	N	103	124	107	131
2. REWARDS P/C	1-3	40.20	59.20	56.74	23.62
	1	14.71	24.80	16.35	1.57
	6	35.29	24.00	20.19	48.82
	N	102	125	104	127
3. SAME P/C	1-3	74.76	56.00	91.59	96.90
	1	51.46	31.20	65.42	79.07
	6	7.77	25.60	5.61	1.55
	N	103	125	107	129
4. INST/FIELD	1-3	68.68	57.50	75.73	44.52
	1	26.26	22.50	33.98	14.84
	6	12.12	16.67	6.80	19.53
	N	99	120	103	128
5. VOLS/P/C	1-3	NA	NA	94.39	95.38
	1			76.64	75.38
	6			2.80	0.77
	N			107	130
6. ACCRED/P/C	1-3	NA	8.95	NA	NA
	1		3.25		
	6		69.92		
	N		123		

*1-3 = chose first of two options; 1 = easy choice of first option; 6 = easy choice or second option.

CHAPTER 6: ADMINISTRATORS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE MISSIONS OF THEIR ORGANIZATIONS

In this chapter, we shall examine the attitudes of administrators of resident theatres, art museums, orchestras and community arts agencies towards the missions of their organizations and the role of management in accomplishing those missions. The vehicle for doing this will be the analysis of two sets of questions: one set eliciting managers' evaluations of the relative importance of ten characteristics of board members; and one set requiring respondents to choose between pairs of statements reflecting different attitudes towards organizational mission and strategy.

The question about board attributes is discussed in this chapter because boards are responsible for policy formation and decisions about goals in nonprofit organizations, and in many public art museums and community arts agencies. The forced-choice questions analyzed in this chapter are those that pose alternative views of the missions of arts organizations, that address, in different ways, the question, "What business are we in?" Development of questions was guided by ongoing debates within the fields surveyed, and items were reviewed by arts managers, service-organization staff, and public arts-agency staff.

Most of the forced-choice questions addressed debates or concerns about the extent to which traditional aesthetic aims of arts organizations should be supplemented by partial reorientations, first, to the market and earned income, and, second, towards education and outreach objectives. The principal purpose of this chapter is to document the attitudes of the administrators surveyed on these issues. A second is to see if such attitudes represent relatively coherent ideological positions, that is, to see if respondents' choices clustered empirically in a way that could be easily characterized. A third is to assess the relative impact of managers' organizations, background, and career experience on these attitudes towards mission. Note that it is not the purpose of this report, nor could these data be used, to assess the validity of any of the attitudes described.

Respondents were asked, "In your opinion, how important is the presence of persons with each of the following characteristics to the effectiveness of [your kind of arts organization]'s board of trustees?" The ten items that they were asked to rank order appear on Table 1. Some of these have to do with the ability to give or get resources: ability and willingness to donate money and connections with the wealthy, business corporations, and government. Others have to do with the board's internal function: willingness to interact with staff, willingness to respect formal hierarchy, and legal or management skills. Two items reflect concern with pluralism and social goals: commitment to education and outreach and representativeness of the community's racial and ethnic groups. And one, personal interest in the arts, is related to the aesthetic mission.

The forced-choice items requested respondents to choose between two statements, each of which reflected a different position on a management or policy issue.[1] These items are listed in Table 2.

---

[1] Responses need not necessarily indicate agreement with the statement chosen. In many cases, respondents may have agreed or disagreed partially with both options. And in many cases, the respondents' personal views were undoubtedly more complex or sophisticated than either of the available options. The value of these questions is not so much in permitting generalization about what arts managers believed as it is in enabling us to compare the positions of different managers on several dimensions. An effort was made, in designing the forced-choice options, to present each statement in a contentious tone, as might an advocate of the position embodied in the statement. In some cases, the tone was softened in an effort (not always successful) to phrase alternatives in a manner that would elicit variation in response.

Most items attempted to counterpose two of three attitudinal orientations that were hypothesized to represent somewhat coherent ideological positions: traditional aesthetic mission; managerialism (emphasis on efficiency and earned income, and orientation to the private sector); and social orientation (emphasis on education and outreach and orientation towards the public sector). Items 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17 present a choice between aesthetic orientation and managerialism. Items 10, 11, and 12 counterpose aesthetic and social orientations. Items 7 and 19 counterpose the managerial and the social.[2] In order to avoid response bias, for those questions in which one statement favored and another opposed a position, "pro" and "con" responses were alternated in the first and second positions from question to question.

Differences in wording from instrument to instrument mean that, for most of the items, responses are not completely comparable across disciplines. The principal value of these data are, first, descriptive of respondents in each discipline and, second, for comparison of attitudes across groups within each field.

Board Member Characteristics

Table 3 displays the percentage of respondents in each field rating each of ten characteristics of board members among the top three in importance. Interest in the artistic substance of the organization's work was rated high in all fields by almost two thirds of the respondents. Also prized highly were the ability and willingness to give money and contacts with business corporations. Almost two thirds of the theatre managing directors, approximately 70 percent of the art-museum directors, and 80 percent of the orchestra managers ranked the latter among the top three (compared to just over one third of the CAA directors). Contacts with business were rated among the top three by from 53 percent of the art-museum directors to almost 70 percent of the orchestra managers. More than half of the performing-arts administrators (but nearer to one third of the art-museum and CAA directors) rated connections with the wealthy highly. And more than half of the art-museum directors ranked willingness to respect the museum's formal hierarchy of authority among the top three board-member attributes in importance.

---

[2] Items 1 through 6 are the professionalism items described in Chapter 5; items 9 and 18 do not fall neatly into this classification.

Managers in all of the fields were much less likely to include among the top three attributes willingness to interact with staff and representativeness of the community's racial and ethnic groups. From one tenth of the art-museum directors to 28 percent of the CAA directors ranked the former highly; while from one in seven orchestra managers to 29 percent of the CAA directors gave high rankings to the latter. Only about one fifth of the performing-arts administrators placed commitment to education and outreach among the top three (compared to almost one third of the art-museum directors and two fifths of the CAA directors). Attitudes towards legal and management skills varied widely by disciplines: Only about one in eight orchestra managers rated this attribute highly, compared to almost one half of the CAA directors.

Thus orchestra managers appeared to seek "donor" boards that will give money and serve as bridges to wealthy individuals and companies. Theatre managing directors also emphasized private-sector resource acquisition, albeit with less unanimity than the orchestra managers. Art-museum directors valued ability to donate and contacts with corporations highly; but were also very concerned with willingness to respect the formal hierarchy. By contrast, CAA directors were diverse in their appraisals, stressing contacts with business, but also skills, commitment to education and outreach, and contacts with government. All groups of managers valued board members with personal interests in their organizations' artistic missions.

Responses to Forced-Choice Questions

Responses to forced-choice questions are presented in Table 4.[3] For each question, the table displays the percentage of respondents choosing the first of two options, and the percentage of all respondents calling their choice of each option an "easy" one.[4]

Resident-Theatre Managing Directors

The vast majority of theatre managing directors (88 percent) chose the statement favoring efforts to increase earned income over one suggesting that such efforts clash with artistic goals. More than half (61 percent) also selected a statement favoring institutionalization over one alleging that institutionalization discourages creativity or innovativeness. Nearly all the respondent managing directors (92 percent) favored more businesslike management techniques over a warning that such techniques are inappropriate for arts organizations.

Almost three fifths agreed with the statement that resident theatres have a responsibility to educate their audience and potential audience rather than with the assertion that educational programs distract attention from the theatre's central artistic task. More than three quarters of the respondents chose "excellence" over "access" as a guide to public subsidy. And almost 75 percent of the managing directors selected a statement indicating that resident theatres could expand their audiences to include many more poor, minority, and working people over an assertion that the theatre's audience will always be limited to individuals who can really understand and appreciate the dramatic art. By a strong majority (88 percent), theatre administrators chose a statement indicating that resident theatres should look towards business (rather than towards government) for an increasing share of revenues in the coming years.[5] Almost half (45 percent) of the respondents favored coordination in planning and programming among arts organizations over a statement stressing the danger to an organization's autonomy of involvement in coordinative efforts.

---

[3] As in the previous chapter, responses to forced choices were merged with responses to related questions about the difficulty of each choice to yield a six-point scale, ranging from "1" (easy choice of first option) to "6" (easy choice of second option).

[4] The percentage choosing the second option always equals 1 minus the percentage choosing the first option.

Art-Museum Directors

Just over one half of the art-museum directors (56 percent) selected the statement that "art museums have become too concerned with maximizing earned income by mounting popular exhibits of dubious scholarly or artistic value" over one praising art museums for learning to boost earned income by designing appealing exhibits. Just about 40 percent chose a statement that museums should use cost-benefit measures in order to be taken seriously by potential patrons, while 60 percent chose the alternative questioning efforts to measure museums' efficiency. Two fifth of the musem directors chose a warning that efforts to use auxiliary activities to increase earned income risk subordinating the museum's artistic goals to commercial ones, while three fifths agreed that museums have a responsibility to exploit commercial opportunities to increase earned income.

---

[5] Shortly before the survey was fielded, the national administration proposed dramatic cuts in the federal arts budget. The salience of this news undoubtedly affected the pattern of response to this question.

Almost two thirds of the respondents selected the assertion that art museums should provide thorough interpretation of exhibited works over a statement warning that extensive interpretation interferes with the relationship between the viewer and the work of art. Seventy percent of the museum directors opted for "excellence" over "access" in the choice between those criteria for public subsidy. And just over half selected the statement that art museums can attract many more poor, minority, and working people over the assertion that museum visitors will always be "the minority of individuals who can really understand and appreciate art." Fully 86 percent of the directors chose the statement that art museums should look to business to provide an increasing share of their revenues in coming years, over an alternative saying the same of government. More than 60 percent of the art-museum directors chose a statement favoring coordination of planning and programming of museums over one worrying that such coordination threatened museum autonomy.

Orchestra Managers

Five sixths of the orchestra managers chose a statement praising orchestras for using marketing and programming to boost earned income in contrast to the assertion that orchestras worry too much about earned income and too little about challenging and innovative programming. Fully 83 percent of the orchestra managers selected a statement favoring use of commercial administrative practices over one asserting that the efficiency of performing-arts organizations cannot be measured.

The vast majority of orchestra managers (90 percent) rejected the assertion that educational programs divert attention from artistic goals in favor of the statement that "the orchestra must go beyond its regular programming to educate its audience and potential audience." Two thirds of the orchestra managers chose "excellence" over "access" as a basis for public support for the arts. Just over one half (57 percent) chose the assertion that orchestras can increase markedly the number of poor, minority, and working people in their audiences, compared to 43 percent who chose the statement that the orchestra's audience will always be limited to the few individuals who can really understand and appreciate music. Almost all (95 percent) of the orchestra managers chose to look to business rather than government for increased revenues in the future. Over 60 percent agreed that coordination of planning and programming with other arts organizations represents a threat to autonomy, rather than that such coordination is increasingly necessary in the current fiscal environment.

Community Arts Agency Directors

Almost two thirds of the CAA directors (63 percent) chose a statement indicating that CAAs should develop more efficient administrative techniques like those of the better run social-service agencies over an alternative statement indicating that this was impossible and warning against bureaucratization. The CAA directors chose business over government as a future source of increased revenues with almost as great unanimity as the orchestra managers (92 percent). Over 70 percent of the CAA directors selected the assertion that CAAs worry too much about getting grants and too little about earning income over the statement that CAAs should provide services for individuals and organizations that are too poor to pay for them. Over 70 percent supported rather than opposed regional coordination of the planning and programming of community arts agencies.

And more than 85 percent preferred the statement that CAAs should provide artistic programming that is otherwise unavailable to the assertion that the CAA's major task is providing support services to other arts organizations.

Almost four fifths of the respondents selected the statement that CAAs should go beyond the traditional arts to support and encourage minority and neighborhood arts groups over the assertion that CAAs should concentrate on the most important and highest quality organizations within their communities. Almost three quarters of the CAA directors chose "access" over "excellence" as a criterion for public support. And almost 90 percent chose the assertion that traditional arts organizations could expand their audiences to include far more poor, minority, and working people if they tried to the statement that the audiences for art museums and symphony orchestras will always be limited to the minority who can appreciate great art and music.

Summary

Although responses to most items are not comparable across disciplines because of variation in item wording, we can make some rough generalizations. Respondents in all disciplines tended to voice support for statements supporting improved administrative techniques; and majorities (albeit sometimes small ones) in each field voiced sympathy with the goals of education and outreach. Art-museum directors were more likely to choose statements expressing skepticism about or distaste for earned-income-producing schemes; while CAA directors were most supportive of statements endorsing educational goals and the principal of access. Enough variation in response appears that no group can be characterized as wholly aesthetically oriented, socially oriented, or managerial in perspective.

Variation by Cohort

There were no major variations associated with cohort differences in responses to the question about the desirable qualities of board members. More differences emerged in response to the forced-choice items.

The most senior cohort of theatre administrators expressed somewhat weaker support for social values than did other groups. They were somewhat more likely than the most junior managing directors (86 to 67 percent) to emphasize "excellence" over "access"; and only about half as likely as the latter to report choosing easily the statement (item 12) that resident theatres could greatly expand the number of poor, working, and minority people in their audiences. They were also substantially less likely than other groups (one quarter, compared to almost 40 percent in the middle cohort and two thirds of the most junior managing directors) to select the response favorable to coordination in item 9. As a group, then, the more senior managing directors expressed somewhat greater commitment to aesthetic values, particularly in contrast to social values, than did the other managing directors. But the differences were relatively small. Moreover, it is unclear whether the differences represent a cohort effect or, instead, an aging effect, perhaps associated with the movement of managers to larger and more prestigious theatres as their careers progress.

More junior art-museum directors were approximately twice as likely as their colleagues to choose the statement (item 13) endorsing the use of broadly appealing exhibits to raise earned income over the sentence deploring income-earning exhibitions. Over half of the most senior directors compared to just one in three of the most junior, chose the statement (item 16) questioning the use of museum shops and similar means of generating earned income. Support for "excellence" over "access" was monotonically related to seniority, with more than 80 percent of the most experienced directors, compared to almost half of the least experienced, choosing the statement favoring the former. Seniority was also monotonically related to attitudes towards coordination, with from 28 percent of the most junior directors compared to 56 percent of the most experienced choosing the anti-coordination option in item 9. In general, then, among art-museum directors seniority was associated with the choice of aesthetic over social and, to a lesser extent, managerial perspectives.

For orchestra managers, seniority was associated with rejection of managerial in favor of aesthetic concerns in the forced-choice items. Nearly one quarter of the most senior managers (compared with just 9 percent of the most junior) agreed (item 8) that orchestras are often too concerned with maximizing earned income at the expense of the quality of their musical programming. Nearly one third of the most senior managers (compared to 15 percent of the middle cohort and just one of thirty-one less experience managers) agreed (item 13) that the efficiency of symphony orchestras cannot be measured.

Seniority was also associated negatively with support for social over aesthetic values among the orchestra managers. More than one fifth of the most senior managers (compared to just three of sixty-five other respondents) endorsed a statement (item 10) that educational programs can deflect energy from orchestras' central artistic goals. Fewer than 60 percent of the members of the two more junior cohorts chose "excellence" over "access" (item 11) compared to 85 percent of the most senior. The most senior orchestra managers, like the most senior managers in other fields, were also less likely to choose the pro-coordination alternative (three fifths of the most junior managers compared to just one in four of the most senior). Thus in the orchestra field, as elsewhere, seniority was associated with support for traditional aesthetic values. In each case, it is unclear whether variation by cohort represented a decline in traditional aesthetic concerns over time, a filtering process that screens out administrators with less aesthetic orientations over the course of their careers, or attitude changes associated with movement to larger or more prestigious organizations.

Because of the briefer cohort spans among the community-arts respondents, cohort variation was far less marked than in the other fields. Like their peers in the other disciplines, the more senior CAA directors were more likely to choose "excellence" over "access" (more than one third) than were less experienced CAA directors (just over one quarter of the middle cohort and fewer than one fifth of the most junior).

Administrative Orientations and Their Determinants

The previous sections described the responses of administrators to individual items and examined how these responses varied among managers of differing levels of seniority. They did not, however, enable us to assess the extent to which the respondents' choices cohered into the dimensions of administrative ideology (managerial, aesthetic, and social) posited to exist earlier in this chapter. Nor did they describe the determinants of variation in administrative orientations by examining the net effects of such factors as seniority, organizational budget, experience, and professional participation, controlling for all simultaneously. The questions that this section address are: first, do responses to attitude questions cluster in a manner that permits us to identify managerial, aesthetic, or social orientations within the fields surveyed; and, second, if so, what determines the extent to which administrators hold such orientations.

Patterns of Administrative Orientation

In order to pursue the first of these questions, factor analyses were undertaken for each field of responses to questions about director attributes, board-member characteristics, the "increase accessibility" function of service organizations, the forced choices, and a series of questions about the desirability of different forms of revenues. The latter asked respondents to rank order, on the basis of desirability, ten sources of income: endowment, admissions, membership, other earned income, private philanthropy, corporate philanthropy, foundation grants, federal, state, and municipal support. These were included because it was hypothesized that a managerial orientation would be associated with a disposition in favor of earned income and corporate aid, while social orientations would be associated with support for public subsidy.

As expected, factor analyses yielded meaningful "managerialism" and "social-orientation" clusters for every field.[6] The managerialism factor, in each case, included support for management rather than art backgrounds for administrators; and for three of the four fields included positive evaluations of managerial experience, grantsmanship ability, and ability to prepare a budget as criteria for selecting top administrators, and choice of the forced-choice alternative (item 13) favoring businesslike and efficient administrative techniques (Table 5).[7] In the performing arts, specific administrative skills of directors loaded heavily onto the managerial factor. Among the theatre managing directors, desirability of admission revenue loaded positively and desirability of municipal revenue loaded negatively onto managerialism. Among the art-museum directors and orchestra managers, forced-choice preference for business support in the long term (item 7) loaded on managerialism, as did, for the art-museum directors, forced-choice support for income-earning exhibitions and ancillary activities (items 8 and 13). Federal support bore a negative relationship to managerialism among the art-museum directors.

---

[6] In part because of forced-choice question wording, aesthetic orientations were represented by negative scores on the managerial and social dimensions rather than emerging as a third factor.

[7] A negative sign before the coefficient of the forced-choice item indicates support for the first of the two statements, while a positive sign indicates support for the second.

Among the orchestra managers, three director attributes loaded negatively on the managerial factor: knowledge of classical music, commitment to education and outreach, and standing in the field. This factor thus represents not just support for efficiency but also some opposition to aesthetic or social goals. By contrast, for the CAA directors, the managerial factor was associated with a rejection of earned income, particularly endowment and other earned income, as revenue sources. Eigenvalues indicate that "managerialism" accounts for more of the variation of response among the theatre managing directors than among the other groups, and least among the CAA directors.

For each field, the social-orientation factor included high rankings of educational experience and of commitment to outreach as criteria for selecting top administrators; of commitment to education and outreach as a desirable attribute of board members; and of increasing accessibility as a function of service organizations (Table 6). For three of the four fields, grantsmanship as a criterion for selecting a top manager and support for access over excellence (forced-choice item 11) loaded on this factor as well. The social-orientation factor was most similar for the theatre managing directors and the art-museum directors: for each group, it included (in addition to the variables shared with other fields) agreement that the minority, poor, and blue-collar audience could be greatly expanded (item 12) and a preference for federal, state, and municipal support. For the art-museum directors, it was associated with relatively low ratings for endowment income; and for the theatre administrators with a preference for foundation assistance.

Among the orchestra managers, social orientation was associated with high ratings for fund-raising ability and standing in the field as director-selection criteria, in addition to the common variables mentioned above. Among CAA directors, it was associated positively with appreciation of the arts as a criterion for choosing executives, support for grants to neighborhood and minority arts organizations, and support for artistic programming by CAAs.[8] The social-orientation factor explained more variation in responses for the art-museum directors and theatre managing directors than for the orchestra managers and CAA directors.[9]

Predictors of Administrative Orientations

In order to examine the net effects of background, career experience, and other factors on the extent to which administrators' expressed managerial or social orientations in their responses, as opposed to more conventionally aesthetic orientations, regression analysis was employed. Scales were developed for managerial and social orientations, respectively, by standardizing and summing respondents' scores on each variable loading on the relevant factor at .30 or above. The models reported here include those independent variables that had a notable impact on orientations, or the omission of which altered the coefficients of other factors. In addition, budget size and a measure of seniority were included in all regression equations as independent variables.

---

[8] The two latter measures are from forced-choice items asked only of CAA directors.

[9] Among the art-museum directors and CAA directors, two other intrepretable factors emerged. For the art-museum directors, the third dimension represented a kind of private-sector market orientation opposed to conventional aesthetic values. For the CAA directors, the third factor represented an extreme public-sector orientation, involving a strong rejection of the market and of earned income.

Table 7 reports regression analyses of the predictors of scores on on the managerialism dimension in each of the four fields.[10] The models were quite successful (given the subjective nature of the measures upon which the dependent variable was based) in all but the community arts case, explaining between 34 and 44 percent of the variation in managerialism among theatre, art-museum, and orchestra administrators.

Among both the art-museum directors and the orchestra managers, managerialism was strongly and negatively related to seniority, controlling for other predictors. Among the art-museum directors there was also a notable negative effect on managerialism of museum budget size. Female orchestra managers were, other things equal, more managerial in orientation than their peers.

Managerialism was negatively related to measures of family background and educational experience among the art-museum directors and orchestra managers, and positively related among the CAA directors. Parents' educational attainment was a strong negative predictor of managerialism for the art-museum directors, while the quality (Astin score) of the college from which one received his or her B.A. had a similar impact among orchestra managers. By contrast, having attended a private school was the strongest predictor of managerialism among the CAA directors.

---

[10] On the interpretation of Tables 7 and 8, see Chapter 3, note 3.

Theatre administrators' degree of managerial orientation was predicted by three variables: Managing directors ranked higher on the managerial scale if they held a degree in business or management; if they had ever worked in resident-theatre marketing, development, or public-relations staff; and if they had never worked as artistic directors, actors, or theatre technical staff.

Career-experience variables were also strong (negative) predictors of managerialism among art-museum directors. Other things equal, directors were far less likely to score high on managerialism if they had earned a Ph.D. in art history or had ever held a professorial appointment. By contrast, career-experience measures had no important effects on the scores of orchestra managers or CAA directors.

Controlling for other factors, professional participation (a measure based on a count of the number of professional activities in which a respondent reported taking part) had a strikingly positive impact on managerialism in every field but the community arts. This was true even among art-museum directors and orchestra managers, for whom the simple correlations between managerialism and participation were close to zero. What this means is that the factors that predicted participation were different from and to some extent opposite to those that predicted managerialism; but that if one controls for these factors, directors who are more active in their professional field are more likely to express managerial views than would be less active managers with similar backgrounds and experiences.

Table 8 reports results of the regression analyses predicting degree of social orientation in each of the four fields. Among the theatre managing directors, social orientation was very negatively related to organization budget, positively related to seniority in the resident-theatre field, and negatively with having attended a private school and with parents' social class.

By contrast, the social-orientation scores of art-museum directors were unrelated to museum budget size, and negatively related to seniority. As in the case of the theatre managing directors, having attended a private school was a negative predictor of social orientation, as were, to a lesser extent, parental social class and educational attainment. The most important negative predictors of social orientation were having a Ph.D. in art history and experience as a professor, two factors that also exerted a strong negative effect on managerialism and would seem to be associated with a strongly aesthetic conception of the museum's role. The strongest and most significant positive predictor of social orientation among the art-museum directors was participation in professional activities.

The social-orientation scores of orchestra managers were predicted largely by just three variables. Holding other factors constant, social orientation was stronger among women managers than among men and lower for managers with arts experience before entering the orchestra field than among those without it. Years of experience in the orchestra field also had a modest positive effect.

The social orientation of CAA directors was unrelated to their organizations' budgets and to their seniority. Indeed, the only important predictor was their college's "quality" score: Directors who had attended selective colleges were less likely, other things equal, to score high on this scale than others. Women directors had higher social-orientation scores, other things equal, than men.

Note that variation in administrators' scores on the managerialism dimension were explained largely by their adult educational and career experiences; by contrast their scores on the social dimension were largely influenced by family background or gender in every field.

Conclusion

We have seen that administrators' responses to attitude questions clustered together in groups that reflected managerial and social orientations, respectively, towards the management and priorities of arts organizations. The former emphasized efficiency and market standards in the governance of arts organizations. The latter emphasized education, outreach, and public-sector responsibility. Each of these orientations opposes, to some degree, more traditional aesthetic views of the mission of arts organizations. Such aesthetic conceptions stress the role of arts organizations in supporting scholarship, preservation, and opportunities for innovation; and the importance of maintaining the autonomy of the arts from the demands, on the one side, of the market for efficiency and, on the other, of the public for relevance or service.

In all fields but the community arts, the analyses in this chapter indicate that this aesthetic perspective is more closely held by senior administrators, while younger managers are more likely to express social or managerialist views. If this finding reflects stable differences among cohorts (as opposed to the effects of aging on attitudes), then managerialism is likely to increase in the performing arts and museums in the coming years. For the theatre managing directors, for example, managerialism was positively associated with holding a degree in business and prior experience in marketing, public relations, or development, both of which appeared to be becoming more common. Managerialism was negatively associated with having production experience, which fewer managing directors now possess. And managerialism was positively associated with professional participation, suggesting that, other things equal, administrators with managerial perspectives are likely to play influential roles in their fields as a whole.

Similarly, among the art-museum directors, managerialism was negatively associated with years of experience but positively associated with participation. To the extent that young directors with managerialist perspectives play more active roles in the art-museum community, their orientations are likely to spread. Nonetheless, the increased percentage of directors with Ph.D.s and professorial experience (both powerful negative predictors of managerial perspectives) may represent a strong countervailing force in this field.

By contrast, the regression analyses provided little reason to expect change in the social orientation of performing-arts administrators. Among art-museum directors, on the other hand, professional participation exerted such a strong positive effect on social orientation that we might expect orientation to the museum's educational mission to increase over time. Again, however, the strongly negative effects of having a Ph.D. in art history and professorial experience could excercise a countervailing force. Indeed, if the museum's historical alternation between education and connoisseurship is any guide, we can expect aesthetic and social orientations to continue to co-exist in American art museums for many years.

Table 1: Wording of Board-Member Items

Question: In your opinion, how important is the presence of persons with each of the following characteristics to the effectiveness of a resident theatre's[1] board of trustees?

Item	Wording	Short Form[3]
1.	Willingness and ability to donate money	DONATE
2.	Personal interest in the arts	INTEREST
3.	Willingness to interact with theatre[2] staff at the departmental level	INTERACT
4.	Connections with wealthy individuals	WEALTHCON
5.	Commitment to education and outreach	EDUCATION
6.	Connections with business corporations	BUSCON
7.	Legal or management skills	SKILLS
8.	Representativeness of community's racial and ethnic groups	ETHNIC
9.	Influence in government circles	GOVCON
10.	Willingness to respect orchestra's formal heirarchy of communications	HIERARCH

1. Orchestra, art museum, community art's agency, in respective instruments.
2. Orchestra, museum, and agency, in respective instruments.
3. Short form used in subsequent tables.

Table 2: Forced-Choice Alternatives by Discipline

Item		Theatre Managing Directors	Short Form[1]
7.	1	Resident theatres should look to business corporations to provide an increased proportion of their support in years to come.	BUS/GOV
	2	Resident theatres should look towards government to provide an increased proportion of their support in years to come.	
8.	1	Resident theatres are often too concerned with maximizing earned income.	EARNED/CP[2]
	2	Resident theatres have come a long way in recognizing the importance of boosting earned income.	
9.	1	In the current fiscal environment it is increasingly important that performing-arts organizations coordinate their planning and programming with one another.	COORD/PC
	2	While some forms of cooperation are useful, theatres that become too involved in coordinating their activities with other arts organizations risk losing their autonomy and flexibility.	
10.	1	In order to fulfill its responsibility to its community, the resident theatre must go beyond its regular programming to educate its audience and potential audience.	EDUC/PC
	2.	Resident theatres should concentrate on presenting innovative drama of the highest quality: Educational programs can deflect energy from this central task.	
11.	1	Public subsidy to the arts should be directed to those institutions which, by virtue of a record of professional excellence, have proven that they can use it best.	EX/ACC
	2	Public subsidy to the arts should be directed to providing artistic experience to as many Americans as possible.	
12.	1	If resident theatres made a serious effort, they could eventually expand their audience to include far greater numbers of the poor, minorities, and working people.	OUTRCH/PC
	2	No matter what resident theatres do to attract the public, their audience will always be limited to those individuals who can really understand and appreciate the dramatic art.	
13.	1	In order to be taken seriously by potential patrons, theatres must develop efficient administrative methods similar to those used in business enterprises.	ADMIN/PC
	2	Efforts to institute business practices in performing arts institutions reflect a profound misunderstanding of the nature of such organizations and the theatre's goals.	

(continued)

Table 2 (continued)

Item		Theatre Managing Directors	Short Form[1]
14.	1	While some degree of financial stability is desirable, institutionalized resident theatres are likely to lose the commitment to innovation and the creative flare that make them distinctive.	INST/CP
	2	Institutionalization is essential if the resident theatre is to achieve the level of professional excellence that is its goal.	
15.	1	New developments like video-disks and cable television represent a potentially important new source of earned income that theatres should pursue aggressively.	TECH/PC
	2	The resident theatre's first commitment is to presenting professional quality live drama: video and film can never capture the excitement of a live performance.	
16.	NA		
17.	1	Resident theatres should avoid entanglements with the commercial stage: the purposes of the two sectors are so distinct that they are really in quite different businesses.	COM/CP
	2	Closer ties to the commercial stage can only help resident theatres, and resident-theatre administrators should have previous experience in the commercial stage.	
18.	NA		
19.	NA		

Item		Art Museum Directors	Short Form
7.	1	Art Museums should look to business corporations to provide an increased proportion of their support in years to come.	BUS/GOV
	2	Art museums should look towards government to provide an increased proportion of their support in years to come.	
8.	1	Art museums have become too concerned with maximizing earned income by mounting popular exhibits of dubious scholarly or artistic value.	EARNED/CP
	2	Art museums have come a long way in recognizing the importance of boosting earned income by designing exhibits that appeal to large segments of the public.	
9.	1	In the current fiscal environment, it is increasingly important that museums coordinate their planning and programming with one another.	COORD/PC
	2	While some forms of cooperation are useful, museums that become too involved in coordinating their activities with other museums risk losing their autonomy.	

(continued)

Table 2 (continued)

Item		Art Museum Directors	Short Form
10.	1	In order to fulfill its responsibility to visitors, the art museum should make available thorough interprétation of exhibited works.	EDUC/PC
	2	Works of art should be appreciated on their own terms: extensive interpretation often interferes with the relationship between the viewer and the work of art.	
11.	1	Public subsidy to the arts should be directed to those institutions which, by virtue of a record of professional excellence, have proven that they can use it best.	EX/ACC
	2	Public subsidy to the arts should be directed to providing artistic experience to as many Americans as possible.	
12.	1	If art museums made a serious effort, they could expand their public to include far greater numbers of the poor, minorities, and working people.	OUTRCH/PC
	2	No matter what art museums do to attract the public, their visitors will always be limited to the minority of individuals who can really understand and appreciate art.	
13.	1	In order to be taken seriously by potential patrons, museums must develop cost-benefit measures of efficiency similar to those used in hospitals or schools.	ADMIN/PC
	2	Efforts to measure the efficiency of museums reflects a profound misunderstanding of the nature of museum work and the museum's goals.	
14.	NA		
15.	NA		
16.	1	Museums that rely on auxiliary activities like museum stores or restaurants to increase earned income risk subordinating their artistic functions to commercial ends.	SHOPS/CP
	2	Museums have a responsibility to exploit a wide range of commercial opportunities to increase their earned income.	
17.	NA		
18.	NA		
19.	NA		

Item		Orchestra Managers	Short Form
7.	1	Orchestras should look to business corporations to provide an increased proportion of their support in years to come.	BUS/GOV
	2	Orchestras should look towards government to provide an increased proportion of their support in years to come.	

(continued)

Table 2 (continued)

Item		Orchestra Managers	Short Form
8.	1	Orchestras are often too concerned with maximizing income and too little concerned with performing challenging and innovative programs.	EARNED/CP
	2	Orchestras have come a long way in recognizing the importance of boosting earned income through programming and marketing.	
9.	1	In the current fiscal environment, it is increasingly important that performing arts organizations coordinate their planning and programming with one another.	COORD/PC
	2	While some forms of cooperation are useful, orchestras that become too involved in coordinating their activities with other arts organizations risk losing their autonomy and flexibility.	
10.	1	In order to fulfill its responsibility to its community, the orchestra must go beyond its regular programming to educate its audience and potential audience.	EDUC/PC
	2	Orchestras should concentrate on presenting musical performances of the highest quality: educational programs can deflect energy from this central task.	
11.	1	Public subsidy to the arts should be directed to those institutions which, by virtue of a record of professional excellence have proven that they can use it best.	EX/ACC
	2	Public subsidy to the arts should be directed to providing artistic experience to as many Americans as possible.	
12.	1	If orchestras made a serious effort, they could expand their audiences to include far greater numbers of the poor, minorities, and working people.	OUTRCH/PC
	2	No matter what orchestras do to attract the public, their audience will always be limited to the minority of individuals who can really understand and appreciate music.	
13.	1	In order to be taken seriously by potential patrons, orchestras must develop efficient administrative methods similar to those used in commercial enterprises.	ADMIN/PC
	2	Efforts to measure the efficiency of performing-arts institutions reflect a profound misunderstanding of such organizations and their goals.	
14.	NA		
15.	1	New developments like video-disks and cable television represent a potentially important new source of earned income that orchestras should pursue aggressively.	TECH/PC

(continued)

Table 2 (continued)

Item	Orchestra Managers	Short Form
	2 The orchestra's first commitment is to presenting professional quality live musical performances: video and film can never capture the excitement of a live performance.	
16.	NA	
17.	NA	
18.	NA	
19.	NA	

Item	Community Arts Agency Directors	Short Form
7.	1 CAAs should look to business corporations to provide an increased proportion of their income in years to come.	BUS/GOV
	2 CAAs should look towards state and federal government to provide an increased proportion of their support in years to come.	
8.	NA	
9.	1 CAAs are part of an arts service delivery system: in the current fiscal environment, it is increasingly important that CAAs coordinate their planning and programming on a regional basis.	COORD/PC
	2 While some forms of cooperation are useful, CAAs that coordinate too closely on a regional basis risk losing their autonomy and flexibility.	
10.	1 CAAs should go beyond the traditional arts to support and encourage minority, neighborhood, and other non-traditional arts groups.	EDUC/PC
	2 CAAs should concentrate on providing services for the most important and highest quality organizations in their community: these organizations are the critical cultural resources that the community must preserve.	
11.	1 Public subsidy to the arts should be directed to those institutions which, by virtue of a record of professional excellence, have proven they can use it best.	EX/ACC
	2 Public subsidy to the arts should be directed to providing artistic experience to as many Americans as possible.	
12.	1 If most traditional arts organizations made a serious effort, they could expand their audiences to include far greater numbers of the poor, minorities and working people.	OUTRCH/PC
	2 No matter what art museums or symphony orchestras do to attract the public their audiences will always be limited to the minority of individuals who can really understand and appreciate great art and music.	

(continued)

Table 2 (continued)

Item		Community Arts Agency Directors	Short Form
13.	1	In order to be taken seriously, CAAs must develop efficient administrative methods similar to those used in the better-run social services agencies.	ADMIN/PC
	2	An arts agency can never be run like a social-service agency. CAAs must be careful to maintain their spontaneity and to avoid becoming bureaucratized.	
14.	NA		
15.	NA		
16.	NA		
17.	NA		
18.	1	CAAs' major task is to provide support services to local presenting and exhibiting organizations.	SUP/PROG
	2	CAAs should become involved in artistic programming that provides access to events otherwise unavailable, as well as in providing support services to other arts organizations.	
19.	1	CAAs are often too concerned with garnering grants or public subsidy, and too little concerned with opportunities for increasing their earned income through selling services.	EINC/PC
	2	CAAs should seek to provide services to organizations and constituencies that are too poor to pay for them: attempting to support CAAs by charging is inappropriate.	

1. Short form used in subsequent tables.
2. CP=Con and Pro (in that order); PC=Pro and Con (in that order).

TABLE 3: Percentage Ranking Characteristics of Board Members Among the Top Three (of Ten) in Importance, by Discipline

Item[1]	Theatres		Art Museums		Orchestras		CAAs	
DONATE	63.73	(102)	70.83	(120)	80.19	(106)	34.35	(131)
INTEREST	65.35	(101)	65.00	(120)	65.09	(106)	59.54	(131)
INTERACT	18.18	(98)	10.17	(118)	16.04	(106)	28.46	(130)
WEALTHCON	53.06	(98)	39.17	(120)	53.77	(106)	33.08	(130)
EDUCATION	20.43	(93)	32.50	(120)	19.05	(105)	40.31	(129)
BUSCON	58.82	(102)	53.33	(120)	69.81	(106)	58.02	(131)
SKILLS	30.69	(101)	37.50	(120)	12.26	(106)	46.56	(131)
ETHNIC	17.20	(93)	19.17	(120)	14.29	(105)	29.01	(131)
GOVCON	32.56	(86)	33.33	(120)	20.00	(105)	39.69	(131)
HIERARCH	44.44	(63)	56.30	(119)	25.71	(105)	27.91	(129)

1. For code, see Table 1.

Table 4: Responses to Forced-Choice Items by Discipline

Item[1]	RES[2]	Theatres	Art Museums	Orchestras	CAAs
7. BUS/GOV	1-3	88.35%	85.60	95.33	91.54
	1	68.93	56.80	76.64	67.69
	6	1.94	4.80	0.93	1.54
	N	103	125	107	130
8. EARNED/CP	1-3	12.00	56.00	16.82	NA
	1	3.00	35.20	6.54	
	6	58.00	20.80	53.27	
	N	100	125	107	
9. COORD/PC	1-3	44.66	61.60	39.62	71.32
	1	21.36	38.40	13.21	46.51
	6	27.18	16.80	25.47	12.40
	N	103	125	106	129
10. EDUC/PC	1-3	71.29	65.04	89.72	79.23
	1	42.57	30.89	60.75	43.08
	6	9.90	15.45	1.87	3.08
	N	101	123	107	130
11. EX/ACC	1-3	76.47	70.40	66.04	28.46
	1	48.04	37.60	31.13	9.23
	6	9.80	13.60	12.25	40.77
	N	102	125	106	130
12. OUTRCH/PC	1-3	71.00	52.89	56.60	87.40
	1	42.00	20.66	16.04	51.18
	6	15.00	14.05	15.09	1.57
	N	100	121	106	127
13. ADMIN/PC	1-3	92.23	40.83	83.02	63.28
	1	64.08	12.50	60.38	35.16
	6	1.94	27.50	7.55	20.31
	N	103	120	106	128
14. INST/CP	1-3	38.61	NA	NA	NA
	1	7.92			
	6	29.70			
	N	101			
15. TECH/PC	1-3	49.51	NA	38.89	NA
	1	23.30		14.81	
	6	27.18		32.41	
	N	103		[illegible]	

(continued)

Table 4 (continued)

	Item[1]	RES[2]	Theatres	Art Museums	Orchestras	CAAs
16.	SHOPS/CP	1-3	NA	41.60	NA	NA
		1		15.20		
		6		30.40		
		N		125		
17.	COM/CP	1-3	41.41	NA	NA	NA
		1	6.06			
		6	18.18			
		N	99			
18.	SUP/PROG	1-3	NA	NA	NA	14.73
		1				6.98
		6				48.94
		N				129
19.	EINC/PC	1-3	NA	NA	NA	71.09
		1				27.34
		6				7.03
		N				128

1. For item code, see Table 2.
2. RES=response category. 1-3=chose first of two options; 1="easy" choice of first option; 6="easy" choice of second option.

Table 5: Items in Managerialism Factors (Loadings .30 or Above)

Item[1]	Theatre	Art Museum	Orchestra	CAA
Director Attributes				
1. Aesthetic Knowledge			-.461	
2. Managerial Experience	.686	.442		.541
4. Formal Training in Administration		.369		
5. Tact, Refinement	.331			
6. Grantsmanship	.446		.435	.411
7. Fundraising	.542		.416	
8. Education Experience			-.342	
9. Budgetary Ability	.710	.559		.309
11. Standing in Field	.352		-.308	
12. Marketing Experience	.409		.336	
Forced Choices				
1. Art v. Management Background	.421	.550	.430	.454
7. Bus/Gov		-.345	-.332	
8. Earned/CP		.358		
13. Admin/PC	-.415		-.469	-.376
16. Shops/CP		.427		
Revenue Desirability				
1. Endowment				-.324
2. Admissions	.369			
3. Membership			.340	
4. Other Earned				-.423
8. Federal		-.433		
10. Municipal	-.325			
Eigenvalue	2.99	2.39	2.21	1.97

[1] For key to items, see Chapter 5, Table 5 , and Chapter 6, Table 2.

Table 6 : Items in Social-Orientation Factors (Loadings .30 or Above)

Item[1]	Theatre	Art Museum	Orchestra	CAA
Director Attributes				
3. Arts Appreciation				.390
6. Grantsmanship	.352	.458	.389	
7. Fund-Raising			.404	
8. Education Experience	.396	.474	.417	.406
10. Outreach	.495	.545	.707	.500
11. Standing in Field			.507	
Board Attributes				
5. Education/Outreach	.415	.511	.380	.499
7. Skills	.331			
8. Ethnic		.417		.328
Service Organization Function				
8. Accessibility	.367	.392	.502	.453
Forced Choices				
10. Educ/PC				-.362
11. Ex/Acc	.587	.332		.365
12. Outrch/PC	-.352	-.321		
18. Sup/Prog				.448
Revenue Desirability				
1. Endowment		-.372		
7. Foundations	.347			
8. Federal	.525	.494		
9. State	.606	.638		
10. Municipal	.532	.554		
Eigenvalue	2.90	3.04	2.07	2.38

1. For key to items, see Chapter 5, Tables 5 and 6 , and Chapter 6, Tables 1 and 2.

Table 7 : Regression Analyses of Determinants of Managerialism by Discipline

I.V.s^{1}	Theatre		Art Museum		Orchestra		CAA	
	r	b^{3}	r	b	r	b	r	b
BUDGET	.133	.135	-.236	-.221**	-.260	-.169	-.032	-.045
GENDER (FEMALE)	-.149		.194		.358	.203*	.178	.150
YEARS IN FIELD	.016	-.081	NA		-.281	-.273**	-.103	-.037
YEARS IN ARTS	NA		-.416	-.493***	NA		-.068	
PARED	-.102		-.264	-.190**	.190		.169	
PRIVATE	.071		-.159		.006		.221	.288***
CLASS	.104		-.173		.171		-.036	
EDATT	.182		-.183	.029	-.276	-.171	-.037	
ASTIN	-.013		-.107		-.273	-.234**	.051	
BUSDEG	.310	.225*	NA		-.018^{2}		.085	
ARTPHD^{2}	NA		.231	.335***	NA		NA	
MUSDEG^{2}	NA		NA		.180	.117	NA	
THEADEG^{2}	-.138		NA		NA		NA	
ARTDEG^{2}	NA		NA		NA		-.190	
EVERMGR^{2}	-.372	-.436***	NA		NA		NA	
EVERART^{2}	.233	.181*	NA		NA		NA	
EVERPROF^{2}	NA		.182	.279**	NA		NA	
PREARTS^{2}	NA		NA		.218	.148	NA	
ARTMGR^{2}	NA		NA		NA		.226	.232**
PARTIC	.183	.258**	.029	.159*	-.002	.237*	-.193	
R^2		.338		.435		.359		.148
P		.0001		.0001		.0001		.0011

1. I.V.s are independent variables. PARED=years of education of more educated parent; PRIVATE=attended private secondary school; CLASS=guardian's occupation (3 categories: professional, owner or manager of large business; owner or manager of small business, middle manager, bureaucrat; blue-collar worker or farmer), EDATT=educational attainment in years; ASTIN=Astin quality (selectivity) score of college from which respondent graduated; BUSDEG=earned any postsecondary business degree; ARTPHD=earned Ph.D. in art history; MUSDEG=earned any postsecondary music degree; THEADEG=earned any postsecondary degree in theatre or related subject; ARTDEG=earned postsecondary degree in any of the arts; EVERMGR=has experience as resident-theatre public relations, marketing, or development staff member; EVERART=has experience as actor, artistic director, or theatre technician; EVERPROF=has professorial experience; PREARTS=worked in arts before first orchestra employment; ARTMGR= arts management experience before CAA employment; PARTIC=score on professional participation scale.

Table 7 (continued)

2. Variable scaled inversely: i.e., a positive sign indicates a negative relationship, and a negative sign indicates a positive relationship.

3. "b" is the standardized beta coefficient, ranging from -1.00 to +1.00.
*p equal or less than .05.
**p equal or less than .01.
***p equal or less than .001.

Table 8 : Regression Analyses of Determinants of Social Orientation by Discipline

	Theatre		Art Museum		Orchestra		CAA	
I.V.s[1]	r	b[2]	r	b	r	b	r	b
BUDGET	-.348	-.408***	-.064	-.037	-.123	-.093	-.048	-.012
GENDER (FEMALE)	.154		.173		.290	.322***	.210	.124
SALARY	-.296		-.139		-.136		-.186	-.128
YEARS IN FIELD	.012	.211*	NA		.066	.165	-.010	-.057
YEARS IN ARTS	NA		-.117	-.262**	NA		.028	
PRIVATE	-.313	-.224*	-.248	-.227**	-.010		-.022	
CLASS	-.165	-.143	-.246	-.129	-.108		-.073	
ASTIN	.118		-.121		-.015		-.286	-.240 **
EDATT	.069		-.275	-.102	-.213		-.140	
ARTPHD[3]	NA		.255	.238**	NA		NA	
EVERPROF[3]	NA		.296	.308***	NA		NA	
PREARTS[3]	NA		NA		-.196	-.227*	NA	
PARTIC	-.124		.284	.352***	-.006		-.132	
R^2		.238		.401		.160		.119
p		.0001		.0001		.0011		.0067

1. I.V.s are independent variables. PRIVATE=attended private secondary school; CLASS=guardian's occupation (3 categories: professional, owner or manager of large business; owner or manager of small business, middle manager, bureaucrat; blue-collar worker or farmer); ASTIN=Astin quality (selectivity) score of college from which respondent graduated; EDATT=educational attainment in years; ARTPHD=earned Ph.D. in art history; EVERPROF=has professorial experience; PREARTS=worked in arts before first orchestra employment; PARTIC=score on professional participation scale.

2. 'b' is the standardized beta coefficient, ranging from -1.00 to +1.00. *=p less than or equal to .05; **=p less than or equal to .01; ***=p less than or equal to .001.

3. Variable scaled inversely: i.e., a positive sign indicates a negative relationship and a negative sign indicates a positive relationship.

CHAPTER 7: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In the previous chapters we have examined the backgrounds and careers of senior administrators of resident theatres, art museums, orchestras, and community arts agencies; the rewards they receive from their work and their expectations about future employment; the training they have had and their evaluations of it; and their professional participation and attitudes on a range of management and policy issues. This section will summarize the highlights of the study's findings under three headings, each a topic of importance to arts administrators and policy makers: recruitment and reward; training; and professionalism.

Recruitment and Reward

The 1960s and 1970s were a time of expansion for the arts in two senses. First, many arts organizations grew significantly in size during that period. Second, the number of organizations in many fields grew substantially as well. Growth of both kinds increased employment opportunities, drew people into the labor market for managers, and provided rapid advancement for many of the people thus drawn in. To the extent that growth slows down in the years to come, arts organizations may have a more difficult time recruiting manager; and managers, once recruited, may find fewer opportunities for career growth than did their predecessors.

Indeed, the years of entry of men and women who are now managers into their fields tend to cluster in all the disciplines but the orchestras. Thus more than a third of the theatre managing directors who responded to the survey entered theatre work between 1971 and 1975; more than a third of the art-museum respondents entered museum work between 1966 and 1970; and almost three quarters of the CAA directors entered the commmunity arts between 1975 and 1979. These periods of influx occurred either during or immediately after expansionary eras.

Most administrators came from relatively, but not extremely, privileged social backgrounds. Their parents had more years of schooling and better jobs than most Americans of their age; but, except perhaps for those of the art-museum directors, were not predominantly college educated, professional, or upper managerial. Cohort comparisons indicated that in the museum field and, to a lesser extent, among the theatre administrators, family backgrounds have become less high status over time.

By contrast, the administrators are notable for the extent of their own formal educations. In every field, all but a few top managers possessed college degrees and more than one half pursued their formal education beyond college. Increases in educational attainment over time were most striking among the theatre managing directors and the art museum directors, the latter of whom increasingly had earned Ph.D.s in art history. About half of the theatre managing directors and three fifths of the art-museum directors with college degrees earned them at very selective colleges and universities, compared to about one third of the orchestra managers and fewer than one quarter of the community arts agency (CAA) directors.

All fields but the art museums had incrasing percentages of women in more recent cohorts of administrators. In all fields, women managers administered smaller organizations and tended to have received fewer years of education. Because it is possible that the attrition of women managers will be greater than that of their male counterparts, we cannot assume that their greater representation in more recent cohorts indicates a long-term expansion of opportunity for women administrators. For example, among theatres listed in *Theatre Profiles 2* (1973-4), 30 percent of the manager were women, compared to 37 percent of top administrators listed in *Theatre Profiles 5* (1970-80). Of the women managing directors in *Profiles 2*, only 35 percent reappeared as managing directors in *Profiles 5*, compared to 53 percent of the males.

Administrators were initially recruited into their fields from a variety of sources. About 40 percent of the art-museum directors and orchestra managers entered their disiciplines immediately after completing their formal educations, compared to 30 percent of the theatre managing directors and only about 10 percent of the CAA directors. In none of the disciplines but orchestras (about 20 percent) were administrators frequently recruited from business enterprises.

The first jobs of many respondents in their fields (from one quarter of the art-museum directors to more than 80 percent of the CAA directors) were top administratorships. Minorities in each field entered into aesthetic positions, from 10 percent of the theatre managing directors and orchestra managers who began, respectively, as actors or musicians to two fifths of the art-museum directors entering into curatorial, registration, or exhibition positions.

Nonetheless, many administrators have first-hand familiarity with the arts that they manage. Approximately 20 percent of the orchestra respondents had been employed at some time as musicians; a similar percentage of the CAA directors reported working as visual or performing artists; two fifths of the theatre managing directors had worked as actors or artistic directors (not necessarily on a full-time basis); and more than two fifths of the art-museum directors had been curators. What is more, substantial percentages of top managers in each field reported majoring in the relevant artistic discipline in college.

In the performing arts, however, the percentage of administrators with artistic experience appears to have declined over time: the most recent entrants into the orchestra and theatre fields were more likely to have administrative experience and/or management degrees, and less likely to report artistic experience than were more senior administrators. Similarly, the percentage of art-museum directors who had been curators declined with time as the percentage moving from academic teaching jobs increased.

Arts-administration careers lack the formal structure that traditional professions receive from educational and internship requirements, and that managers of the largest corporations receive from internal labor markets. There are no formal ranks or systematic evaluations as there are in government service to provide individuals with guides to their own progress. Indeed, only in the art museums, where one career pattern (from curator to director) may be in the process of pre-emption by another (from art-history professor to director) are there one or two model career progressions. In the other field, and particularly in the community arts, careers were neither routinized nor predictable.

Such unpredictable career structures are often experienced as stressful. Where careers are sufficiently chaotic, retention of personnel may be difficult. To some extent, expansion may have softened the effects of lack of routinization during the past twenty years. Administrators in all of the fields rose quickly to commanding positions. Median years to first top managership ranged from "none" among the community-arts respondents (where most directors were hired into top positions from outside the field) to about six in the art-museum field.

Most administrators attained their first chief executive position while they were still in their thirties. Contrary to popular belief, arts administrators who remain in their fields do not appear to be job-hoppers: more than half of the managers surveyed had worked for not more than two organizations in their fields, and only about one in ten had held jobs at more than four.

To the extent that the rate of growth (and with it opportunities for career advancement) have declined during the 1980s, arts organizations may have trouble recruiting and, particularly, keeping talented administrators. Just as many colleges have faced difficulty in presidential vacancies during recent years of retrenchment in higher education, so trustees of arts organizations may find it hard, in the coming decade, to find the top administrators that they want.

It is thus all the more important to understand the rewards that keep administrators at their jobs. Organizational budgets and salaries were highest for the art museums and orchestras; lowest for the resident theatres and community arts agencies. Art-museum directors and orchestra managers also reported somewhat higher levels of satisfaction than administrators of theatres or community arts agencies. Directors of the latter were more likely to report it likely that they would accept a job outside the arts (over half compared to about one third of the other respondents); that they would work for public arts agencies (over two thirds compared to from one fifth of the art-museum directors to two fifths of the theatre managing directors); or that they would manage some other kind of arts organization (half of the CAA directors, compared to one fifth of the theatre administrators). These findings suggest that the lack of both resources and other more subjective rewards may lead to attrition in the ranks of CAA directors and, perhaps, in other fields as well.

Holding other factors constant, seniority was related to organizational budget in all fields but the art museums. Also controlling for other factors, women managed smaller organizations than men. Attending a private school or a prestigious college was associated with organizational budget as well. Among the art-museum directors, the best predictor of the resources a director commands was whether or not he or she held a degree from a single prestigious American university. Seniority influences salaries in every field, as does operating budget in all fields but art museums. Women received lower pay than comparable male administrators in every field as well.

Different factors were associated with expecting to leave the arts in different fields. Women theatre managing directors, for example, were more likely to expect to take jobs outside of the arts than were their male counterparts. Orchestra managers with business degrees were less likely, other things equal, to anticipate working outside of the arts than were those without them. Art-museum directors were more likely to anticipate leaving the arts, controlling for other factors, if they had a lot of museum experience for their age and if they had worked as curators. For CAA directors, intention to work outside the arts was negatively associated with college selectivity and years of experience, and positively associated with parental education.

Among all groups but the art museum directors, administrators in the middle cohort were most likely to report it likely that they would take a job outside the arts, perhaps indicating frustration over career blockage among mid-career managers. It is among these mid-career managers and, for the theatres, among female administrators that the dangers of significant attrition are greatest.

These findings suggest the importance of both rewards and relatively stable career paths in recruiting and keeping talented administrators. The danger of attrition appears greatest in local arts agencies, where careers are most chaotic and salaries lowest; and least pressing among the art-museum directors, whose salaries are highest and whose career patterns are most predictable.

Some administrators will always be attracted to the arts: Those surveyed reported deriving satisfaction from many aspects of their work. Yet it is likely to remain difficult - and, to the extent expansion slows, to become more difficult - to attract and retain committed and talented administrators in all of the fields discussed in this report, except possibly art museums. The data reported here suggest that a program aimed at attracting and keeping managers would have to accomplish three things:

1. Raising salaries in fields in which administrators are least well paid;
2. Establishing somewhat more predictable career paths that offer the promise of further opportunities to administrators who reach the top of large or medium-sized organizations relatively early in life; and
3. Offering more equal opportunities to women managers who pursue careers in these fields.

Training

Strikingly few of the administrators surveyed reported that they were well prepared to assume many administrative duties at the time they were appointed to their first top managership. CAA directors (who, on average, were older upon assuming their first directorship than were administrators in other fields) were somewhat more likely to report good preparation, and art-museum directors were somewhat less likely to report having been well prepared for their administrative duties. For each function, for each field, between 10 to 55 percent of respondents reported being poorly prepared, while from 10 to 55 percent reported being well prepared. In short, then, administrators in all four fields believed that their preparation for their positions could have been much better than it was. In particular, preparation for financial management and labor relations was problematic in each field, as were readiness for board relations among theatre managing directors and for marketing and public relations and government relations among art-museum directors.

According to these self-reports, only the theatre managing directors had become more well prepared for their positions during the professional lifetimes of the managers surveyed. The more junior managing directors were more likely than any others to consider themselves well prepared for all functions but labor relations, and less likely to consider themselves poorly prepared for every function but personnel management. By contrast, the least senior art-museum directors and orchestra managers were more likely to report themselves poorly prepared for everything but personnel management than were directors in the middle cohorts of their fields.

Administrators in all fields reported on-the-job training as the principal means by which they had attempted to master each of the management functions about which they were asked. Professional workshops and seminars were also used by many, as were consultants, especially by the art-museum and theatre administrators. A smaller minority of administrators in each field had taken university arts-administration and general-management courses, particularly in the area of financial management. Theatre managing directors reported relatively high rates of attendance at arts-administration courses, while orchestra managers relied more than others on general-management courses. CAA directors took fewer courses, while art-museum directors made less use of professional workshops and seminars.

Attendance at arts-administration and general-management courses appears to be rising among the theatre managing directors. The least senior orchestra managers were also much more likely than their predecessors to report attending arts-administration and general-management courses for a variety of purposes. Attendance at university arts administration courses rose sharply among CAA directors as well.

Global reputations of different training formats were surprisingly consistent from field to field. Respondents in all fields ranked on-the-job training above all other forms, and internships were highly valued as well. Management consultants were ranked very low in every field. Respondents were most polarized around university arts-administration and general-management courses: many ranked these formats high, while many others ranked them low. Change in reputation by cohort appeared only among the theatre managing directors, where relative newcomers were more favorable towards university courses and less favorable towards workshops and seminars than were their colleagues.

Yet when the question specified the management function for which each training format was used and the respondents were limited to those who had actually employed the respective formats, the responses were quite different. Although the reputation of consultants among all administrators was quite low, those managers who reported using consultants reported high levels of satisfaction. By contrast, those respondents who reported using arts-administration programs found them relatively unhelpful for most purposes, even though their generalized reputation was rather high.

These findings reflect subjective appraisals; they do not represent objective measures of the quality of either the preparation of arts administrators nor of different kinds of training formats. They do, however, suggest several points that policy makers should bear in mind:

1. Administrators in all of these fields perceive that their preparation for executive positions was inadequate;

2. On-the-job training is still the most common kind of training in every field;

3. To the extent that evaluations of training formats are sounder when they come from people who have experience with the activities they are evaluating, program decisions based on global reputations of training alternatives are likely to be misguided. Agencies and foundations that have supported the development of specific kinds of management training should consider rigorously evaluating the effectiveness of the programs that they have aided before expending more funds for this purpose.

The Paradox of Professionalism

The term "professionalism" is often used to connote "competence": in this usage, a professional manager is one who is knowledgeable and capable. We have not used the term "professionalism" in this way in this report, because it does not tell us how occupations regarded as professions differ from those that are not seen as professional. (There are, for example, well and poorly trained, competent and incompetent, bricklayers, train conductors, and automotive mechanics; yet few people talk about "professionalism" in those fields, and those who do are not taken very seriously.)

Instead, we have adhered to a definition of professionalism that is based on a tradition of studies of professionals and professionalizing occupations. In this tradition, professions are described as occupations with some or all of the following characteristics: a monopoly of at least somewhat esoteric knowledge; a body of professional ethics or standards; professional associations that enforce these standards, accredit training institutions, and license practitioners; extensive collegial interaction among practitioners employed in different organizations; a commitment to professional standards even when these conflict with organizational goals; and a claim to altruism and disinterestedness in professional practice.

Administrators in all four fields studied participated in an extensive web of local, state-wide, and national professional activities, ranging from explicitly professional societies like the Association of Art Museum Directors to service organizations that function, in some ways, like professional associations, to peer review panels in state and federal arts and cultural agencies. And speeches at association meetings and articles in the fields' publications make frequent reference to professionalism as a goal or a reality.

Yet in none of these fields are managers professionals in the sense that the term is used here. In no case, for example, are practitioners required to hold degrees in a particular management curriculum; nor, in any field, are they licensed by professional panels. What is more, allegiance to values associated with professionalism (mastery of a formal body of expertise, support for professional over organizational standards, licensing for practitioners) was far from universal among the respondents.

It is possible that these findings reflect processes of professionalization that are still incomplete. Indeed, professionalism seems least advanced among community-arts administrators, the newest managerial group; and most advanced (although in its art-historical rather than in its administrative sense) among the art-museum directors, members of the arts' oldest administrative profession. There was some evidence in the surveys of managerial professionalization in the resident stage. Younger managing directors were more likely to have formal training beyond college, to have management degrees and management experience before taking on their first top administrative position, and to report in-service training in university management programs. The attitudes of the more recent entrants to the theatre field were also, in some respects, more akin to traditional professional values than were those of their more senior colleagues. Nonetheless, even the most junior managing directors diverged from the professional model in some respects and, in the other fields, administrators' experiences and attitudes were even less typical of professionalism.

Managerial professionalism in the arts is a movement fraught with paradox. One paradox has to do with the nature of professional management in any field. A second has to do with tensions between managerial and aesthetic professionalism in the arts. A third involves the underlying structure of managerial careers and the absence of a basis in the labor market for an arts-management profession.

First, there exists a tension between the emphasis in professional ideology on peer control and the emphasis in management on the pursuit of the best interests of an organization. If the professional, by definition, must evade organizational control to live up to the standards of his or her profession, the manager, by definition, must exert control for the benefit of his or her organization. If the professional's legitimacy comes from the impossibility of routinizing his or her work, the manager's derives from his or her expertise at making organizational chores more routine. Managerial and professional warrants for occupational authority are different and, to some extent, inconsistent.

Second, within the arts, even among administrators, there is little consensus as to the kinds of expertise that should be expected of managers. In some organizations, the manager must master the techniques of budgeting, marketing, and public relations. In others, subordinates execute these functions and the manager is a catalyst and integrator of the work of others. In still others, the administrator deals primarily with the organization's environment, specializing in fund-raising and public relations. In the absence of uniformity in arts organizations' needs, and thus of consensus about what the expert manager should be expert about, it is difficult to design a formal curriculum, much less to expect that arts organizations will demand a specialized credential of administrative candidates. Uncertainty about the nature of managerial work is reflected in the emphasis on hands-on experience in respondents' criteria for selecting directors and their evaluation of approaches to training.

This uncertainty is confounded by the belief of many (particularly of the older) participants in arts organizations that the chief executive should be someone with aesthetic as well as administrative expertise. Among the administrators surveyed here, this is a minority view in all fields but the art museums. Ironically, however, it is the art-museum directorship that has professionalized at a faster pace than any of the others. More than half of the most recent cohort of art-museum directors responding to the survey held a specialized advanced degree (the Ph.D. in art history); education appears to have become a more important determinant of success, while family background has declined in importance; and art-museum directors were more likely than other respondents to stress the importance of professional codes of ethics, and even to entertain the idea that professional associations should play a role in enforcing such codes. Yet the art-museum directors are least likely to have management training or to value a management background. Theirs is a professionalism in which administrative expertise plays only a minor role.

Finally, there is little evidence in these data that an "arts administration profession" exists in any meaningful sense of the term. The labor markets for the fields investigated here (with the important exception of the community arts) appeared to be highly segmented. Few respondents in any field but the community arts had every been administrators in any other, and few (except for the CAA directors) anticipated ever managing a different kind of arts organization. Very few of the art-museum directors had ever worked for any other kind of museum and nearly as few expected to ever work for one, much less to administer some other kind of arts organization. Many of the CAA directors reported experience in the performing or visual arts; but evidence on the backgrounds of other administrators suggested that the road from disciplinary organizations to the community arts was a one-way street. What is more, few administrators possessed degrees in arts administration, and such degrees were not valued as highly as many other kinds of preparation. For these reasons, it appears that "arts administration" is a term that describes a family of occupations, each with its own labor market, rather than a single profession.

The issue of professionalism should not, however, obscure the real need of arts organizations for strong management in an increasingly complex environment. Arts organizations in the fields studied here face challenges in recruiting talented administrators, in retaining them, and in providing the training that they need to do their jobs well. The growth in the arts during the 1960s and 1970s may have softened the challenges of getting and keeping competent administrators at the same time it made their jobs more complicated than they had once been. Slower growth in the years to come could make those challenges even more pressing and jeopardize the gains in administrative performance that have been achieved.